

The Inevability of the Clash of Civilisation

(Hatmiyyat sira'a Ul-hadharat)



Al-Khilafah Publications

e-mail: info@khilafah.com
website: <http://www.khilafah.com>

Contents

Al-Khilafah Publications

Suite 298

56 Gloucester Road
London SW7 4UB

e-mail: info@khilafah.com

website: <http://www.khilafah.com>

Safar 1423 Hijri-May 2002 CE
Hizb ut-Tahrir

ISBN 1 899 574 28X

Translation of the Qur'an

It should be perfectly clear that the Qur'an is only authentic in its original language, Arabic. Since perfect translation of the Qur'an is impossible, we have used the translation of the meaning of the Qur'an throughout the book, as the result is only a crude meaning of the Arabic text.

Qur'anic *Ayat* and transliterated words have been *italicised* in main part of the book.

Saying of the Messenger ﷺ appear in **bold**

ﷺ - subhanahu wa ta'ala
ﷻ - sallallahu 'alaihi wa sallam
RA - radhi allaho anha/anco
AH - After Hijrah
CE - Common Era

The Meaning of Civilisation (Hadhara)	5
The Meaning of Dialogue (<i>al-hiwar</i>) between Civilisations	9
The Idea of Accepting the Other	19
The Idea of the Alternative Civilisation	27
The Clash between Civilisations The History of the Clash between Islam and other Civilisations	28
Forms of the Clash of Civilisations Intellectual Struggle (<i>as-sira' a ul-fikri</i>)	40
Economic Struggle	42
Political struggle	44
Military Conflict	47
The Probable Evidences of those who deny Civilisation Struggle in Islam	50
Rebutting the Probable Evidences of those Denying the Offensive Jihad (<i>Jihad ut-talab</i>)	57
Conclusion	62

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

The Meaning of Civilisation (Hadhara)



Bismillah ir-Rahman ir-Raheem

A civilisation (*hadhara*) is a collection of concepts about life. Civilisation could be a spiritual divine one (*deeninya ilahiyah*) or man-made (*wadhiyya bashariyyah*). The spiritual divine civilisation emanates from a doctrine ("*aqeedah*"); like the Islamic civilisation that emanates from the Islamic "*aqeedah*". As for the man-made civilisation, either it emanates from a doctrine like the Capitalist Western civilisation that is a collection of concepts about life emanating from the doctrine of separating religion from life. Or it does not emanate from a doctrine like the Shinto, Greek, Babylonian and Assyrian civilisations. This civilisation is a collection of concepts that a people or a group of peoples agreed upon so it is a national (*sh'abiyah*) or man-made civilisation.

In addition, a people or peoples could have a religion (*deen*) and a doctrine whatsoever, but this religion has no concepts about life like Christianity and Buddhism. So people agree on concepts about life specific to them, where these concepts form their civilisation without this having any relationship with their religion, because it does not emanate from it. So their civilisation is not divine despite the fact that they have a religion. Hence, it is possible for various peoples to associate in one civilisation, despite the difference of their religions like the Japanese, Hindus and Sikhs and French; their religions are different but their civilisation is one, namely Capitalism.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

Material objects that are used in life's affairs are not part of civilisation even though they sometimes result from it. There is no objection to give the technical term of '*madaniyya*' for these tangible material objects so as to distinguish them from the collection of concepts for which we used the term '*hadhara*' (civilisation). If these material objects resulted from a specific civilisation like statues then they are part of specific *madaniyya*. However, if they resulted from science and industry, then they are of universal *madaniyya*, like the television, rockets, planes, penicillin etc. Thus *madaniyya* can be specific and it can be universal. This is contrary to civilisation that cannot be but specific. The meaning of specificity (*khususiyya*) is related to our adoption. So what is specific is not permitted for us to adopt from others, whereas what is universal is permitted for us to adopt.

The distinction between civilisation (*hadhara*) and *madaniyya* must be observed at all times, just as it is imperative to observe the distinction between the material objects derived from civilisation and the material objects derived from science and industry. That is in order to observe, when adopting *madaniyya*, the distinction between its objects, and the distinction between it and civilisation. There is no objection to adopting Western *madaniyya* derived from science and industry. As for Western *madaniyya* derived from Western civilisation, it is not permitted to adopt it in any case whatsoever due to its contradiction with the Islamic civilisation in the basis upon which it is built namely the doctrine ('*aqeedah*). Our '*aqeedah*' is different from their doctrine that is built upon the compromise solution and separating religion from life; in the depiction of worldly life or the criterion for actions; which is the halal and haram for us, and benefit for them; and in the meaning of happiness which is permanent tranquillity, which is - for us - attaining the pleasure of Allah, and for them the bodily pleasures.

In order that we become fully aware of what we adopt from others and what we leave, it is necessary to distinguish between civilisation and *madaniyya*, and it is necessary to distinguish between *madaniyya* resulting from civilisational concepts and *madaniyya* resulting from pure sciences and industry.

If it is said: Why did you adopt the technical term '*hadhara*' for concepts and the term '*madaniyya*' for material forms instead of the

reverse? *Hadhara* in language, is residence in a civilised region (like towns), while '*al-hadhir*' is the one who is of towns and villages. Al-Qatami said: 'Whoever is pleased with residing in towns. Which Bedouin men will see us?'

While '*madana*' in the place means to reside therein, and '*madina*' means also to arrive to the town (madinah), so the two meanings are close to each other. It is said in response to this (self-directed) question: *hadhara* is used in the language for meanings related to thoughts, so it is closer to use it for concepts. It was said in 'Al-Qamus': "*Hadhura* is like nadusa which is the man of eloquence. (*bayan*) and understanding (*fiqh*)."¹ In Al-Lisan, it is said: "a man '*hadhr*' to mean eloquent, and a man '*hadhir*' if he brought something good."² It also came in 'Al-Lisan': "And in the hadith: 'Say that which *yahdhurukum*' i.e. that which is present and existing in you, and do not burden yourselves with something else."³ So *hadhara* is closer, more consistent and appropriate to use for the collection of concepts than using *madaniyya*, and *madaniyya* is closer to be used in material objects. It has been said that there is no contest in technical terminology (*istilah*), and what is important is distinguishing between concepts and material objects derived thereof, and material objects derived from them and material objects derived from pure sciences, inventions and industry. The first is rejected and it is not permitted to take them, while it is permitted to take the second.

We have said that the civilisation (*hadhara*) is a collection of concepts about life, and that either it is a spiritual divine one (*deeniyya*) or man-made. An example of the spiritual divine civilisation is the Islamic civilisation, and an example of the man-made are the Indian civilisation and Western civilisation. The existence of these civilisations is a definite matter and an incontestable established fact. Likewise is the difference between them, such that none but the liar can deny it. The source of the divine civilisation, according to its people, is revelation; the source of the man-made civilisation is the people who agreed on it. This alone suffices is enough for distinction and difference. Even if there appears a type of meeting in some of the concepts, this is not an agreement or a common matter. This is because civilisation, when it is adopted, must be adopted together with the basis from which it emanated or the basis it is built upon. So if the basis between two civilisations is different, the agreement between some of their concepts, or the existence of similarity

between some of their concepts about life, is worth no attention. This is because the concept is a branch from its basis (*ash*), and it cannot be adopted except with its basis. Both the Islamic civilisation and the Western civilisation allow eating fish, wearing wool, private property, delegating the woman, accounting the ruler and taking medicine. However, these and their like are not considered of the Islamic civilisation unless they are adopted based upon being revelation from Allah to Muhammad ﷺ i.e. upon their being *Shar'a*, whereas they are adopted in the Capitalist civilisation based upon their being of interest (*maslaha*) or their being ameliorated by their minds. If the Muslim adopts them based upon their interest (*maslaha*) or the rational amelioration, it is not considered adopting from Islam.

The difference between civilisations is a matter of fact without any possibility to deny it. What concerns us is the difference between the Islamic civilisation and others, in particular the Western civilisation, and what results from this difference or is built upon it, such as the issues of dialogue (*al-hiwar*), the clash (*as-sira'a*), the possibility of founding one universal civilisation, the forms and types of clash and will the clash cease, hide or will there be a victory for one civilisation over others? What is meant by religious dialogue between religions in view of those who call for it, and what is the correct position regarding it? What is the difference between religions and civilisations etc?

Religions are of two types: A *deen* (religion) from which a civilisation emerges i.e. it has a collection of concepts about life, like the Islamic *deen*, and a religion from which no civilisation emerges - and there is no collection of concepts therein - like the Christian religion. Though it has ideals like 'Do not steal and do not commit *zina*', however, it has no collection of concepts covering all aspects of life. Hence, the Christian religion is an appropriate example of a religion from which no civilisation emanates.

The Capitalist civilisation does not emanate from the Christian religion; even if it came about in countries where the majority of their populations are Christians. So the dialogue or clash or partnership between Islam and Christianity differs from the dialogue or clash between it and the Capitalist civilisation.

The Meaning of Dialogue (al-hiwar) between Civilisations

When we say dialogue or clash, we mean Muslims, their *deen* and their civilisation on one side; and Christians and their religion and the Capitalists and their civilisation, on the other side. It is a malicious attempt that the leaders and intellectuals of the Capitalist civilisation differentiate between Islam and its followers i.e. between Islam and Muslims. So they claim that Islam is great but Muslims are backward and some of them are terrorists. They are liars in their view, for if Islam was really great in their view, then they would have embraced it. However they attempt to delude the naïve from amongst Muslims, attempting to reduce the rancour against them when they strike a Muslim people, or when they attempt to spread the concepts of their civilisation among Muslims. They know that the Islamic 'aqeedah still remains in the souls of Muslims and it is strong in the majority of them. So if they openly declare their enmity to Islam, they will stir up Muslims and provoke them. Thus they use these deceptive sentences as a weapon to anaesthetise Muslims and to deceive them. Some Muslims would swallow this bait and accept dialogue by the meaning presented by Christians and Capitalists or promoted by their agent intellectuals. They concentrate in the definition of this dialogue upon three matters: The first is equality between religions and civilisations in the dialogue without superiority or preference of a religion or civilisation over another. The second is that the limit of the dialogue is restricted to mere knowledge of the other's opinions without addressing its refutation or invalidation. The third is creating an alternative civilisation through the method of arriving at the common denominators between the two religions and two civilisations.

This is the meaning of dialogue in their view, and its benefit as they claim is: "Productive interaction between cultural peculiarities, to form an alternative superior civilisation, that invites to accept the other on the same footing" (Dr. Milad Hana in a cultural debate held in Cairo on Monday, 2/4/2001). And: "Every time civilisations seek to find what is common between them and what is human, they advance, flourish; and peace would spread" (Dr. Jafar Abdussalam, the Secretary-General of the Conference of Islamic Universities). One of them went to the extent of saying that: "Islam is a *deen* of interaction and a *deen* of development, and not like what is said that it is a *deen* of obscurity and a *deen* of isolation. On the contrary, the golden age of Islam and Muslims was

when the Islamic civilisation interacted with other civilisations in the world, and when Islam spread in the world, took from and had a room for all the legacies and other human civilisations and gave them from its legacy and civilisation. This was the golden age of the Islamic State." (Dr. Qasim Jafar spoke, in a study circle on 'The First War of the Century', on Al-Jazeera channel, under the heading: 'Are the American explosions an incentive for dialogue or the clash of civilisations?' on 29/9/2001). He said: "It is upon us as Arabs and Muslims to abstain from this problem...it is upon us to possess sufficient confidence in ourselves, in our civilisation, and in our history and legacy, so as to burst forth in the world from the position of equality, and not the position of the follower (*tabi'*)..." (The above-mentioned study circle of Al-Jazeera channel). Another said: "The Islamic civilisation was based upon the common denominator between world civilisations so it accepted the other and interacted with it in taking and giving (Amru Abdulkarim, a political scientist - IslamOnline.net). Another person attempted to use as evidence for the dialogue of civilisations the *aayaat* of the Noble Qur'an so he said: "And our Book, the Glorious Qur'an, emphasises upon the manner of dialogue with the others, dialogue with polytheists (*mushrikeen*):

وَإِنْ أَحَدٌ مِّنَ الْمُشْرِكِينَ اسْتَجَارَكَ فَاجْرِهُ حَتَّىٰ يَسْمَعَ كَلَامَ اللَّهِ التُّوبَةٌ 6

'If one of the polytheists seeks your protection, grant him protection until he hears the word of Allah' [TMQ At-Tauba: 6], dialogue with disbelievers (*kafireen*):

قُلْ يَا أَيُّهَا الْكَافِرُونَ الْكَافِرُونَ 1

'Say: O you disbelievers' [TMQ Al-Kafirun: 1], dialogue with the current and official religions in the world:

يَا أَهْلَ الْكِتَابِ تَعَالَوْا إِلَىٰ كَلَمَةٍ سَوَاءٌ بَيْنَنَا وَبَيْنَكُمْ أَلَا تَعْبُدُ إِلَّا اللَّهُ وَلَا
تُشْرِكُ بِهِ شَيْئاً وَلَا يَتَخَذَ بَعْضُنَا بَعْضًا أَرْبَابًا

آل عمران 64

'O People of the Book, come to a just word between us and you: That we worship none but Allah, that we associate nothing with Him, nor some of us take others as lords' [TMQ Al-Imran: 64], dialogue from a position of equivalence...I view that it is not possible to say of eternal struggle because we are

Muslims. I point to the Qur'anic *ayah*:

تَعَالَوْا إِلَىٰ كَلَمَةٍ سَوَاءٌ بَيْنَنَا وَبَيْنَكُمْ
آل عمران 64

'Come to a just word between us and you' [TMQ Al-Imran:64]. This *ayah* means that it is possible for us to dialogue with Christians, we dialogue with Jews, and we dialogue with others. Why? Meaning there is a common word between us; we do not say that we dialogue to our word" (Ata-Allah Muhajirani, Iranian President adviser for the dialogue of civilisations in the above mentioned study circle of Al-Jazeera). There are those who call to dialogue between religions to create common denominators between them, and stay silent about the points of difference, in order to anaesthetise Muslims from the clash. They call to the saying of 'the sons of Abraham' to strengthen dialogue between the three religions on the basis that those who came with them descend from one father namely Ibrahim (as). Some Muslims use as proof the *aayaat* of Noble Qur'an that say the Prophets were Muslims, like His ﷺ saying at the tongue of Nuh:

وَأَمِرْتُ لِأَنْ أَكُونَ أَوَّلَ الْمُسْلِمِينَ الزمر 12

"And I was commanded to be the first of the Muslims" [TMQ 39:12] at the tongue of Ibrahim and Ismail:

رَبَّنَا وَاجْعَلْنَا مُسْلِمِينَ لَكَ وَمَنْ ذُرَّبَنَا أُمَّةً مُسْلِمَةً لَكَ {2:128}

"Our Lord! Make us Muslims to you and of our descendants Muslims to you" [TMQ Al-Baqarah: 128] and about the people of Lut:

فَمَا وَجَدْنَا فِيهَا غَيْرَ بَيْتٍ مِّنَ الْمُسْلِمِينَ النَّادِيَات 36

"But We did not find therein but one house of the Muslims" [TMQ Az-Zariyat: 36] and at the tongue of the disciples (*hawariyyin*):

وَأَشْهَدُ بِأَنَا مُسْلِمُونَ آل عمران 52

"And bear witness that we are Muslims" [TMQ Al-Imran: 52]. Perhaps

there will come those who say that Christians and Jews are Muslims, and we hear those who say that the followers of the three religions are believers even though the Qur'anic texts, definitely proved and of definite meaning, are decisive in charging Jews and Christians with disbelief (*kuffar*) such as His ﷺ saying:

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ يَكْفُرُونَ بِاللَّهِ وَرَسُولِهِ وَيُرِيدُونَ أَنْ يُفْرَقُوا بَيْنَ اللَّهِ وَرَسُولِهِ
وَيَقُولُونَ نُؤْمِنُ بِعَضٍ وَنَكْفُرُ بِعَضٍ وَيُرِيدُونَ أَنْ يَتَّخِذُوا بَيْنَ ذَلِكَ سَبِيلًا
أُولَئِكَ هُمُ الْكَافِرُونَ حَقًا وَأَعْنَتْنَا لِلْكَافِرِينَ عَذَابًا مُهِينًا*

"Verily those who disbelieve in Allah and His Messenger and wish to distinguish between Allah and His Messenger and say: 'We believe in some and disbelieve in others' and wish to adopt a way in between. Those are in truth disbelievers, and We have prepared for the disbelievers a humiliating punishment" [TMQ An-Nisa: 150-1].

And:

لَمْ يَكُنْ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا مِنْ أَهْلِ الْكِتَابِ وَالْمُشْرِكُونَ مُنْفَكِّينَ حَتَّىٰ تَأْتِيَهُمْ
الْبَيِّنَاتُ رَسُولٌ مِّنَ اللَّهِ يَتْلُو صُحْفًا مُّظَهَّرًا

البينة 1-2

"Those who disbelieve among the People of the Book and the polytheists were not going to leave (their disbelief) until there came to them clear evidence. A Messenger from Allah reciting pure pages" [TMQ Al-Baiyinah: 1-2].

And:

قُلْ يَا أَهْلَ الْكِتَابِ لَمْ تَكُفُرُونَ بِآيَاتِ اللَّهِ وَاللَّهُ شَهِيدٌ عَلَىٰ مَا تَعْمَلُونَ
آل عمران 98

"Say: O People of the Book, why do you disbelieve in the aayaat of Allah while Allah is witness over what you are doing?" [TMQ Al-Imran: 98].

And:

مَا يَوَدُ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا مِنْ أَهْلِ الْكِتَابِ وَلَا الْمُشْرِكُونَ أَنْ يُنَزَّلَ عَلَيْكُمْ مِنْ
خَيْرٍ مِنْ رَبِّكُمْ وَاللَّهُ يَخْتَصُ بِرَحْمَتِهِ مَنْ يَشَاءُ وَاللَّهُ ذُو الْفَضْلِ الْعَظِيمِ

القرة 105

"Those who disbelieve of the People of the Book and polytheists do not like that there should descend upon you any good from your Lord. But Allah chooses for His mercy whoever He wills. And Allah is the Owner of great bounty" [TMQ Al-Imran: 105].

And:

يَا أَهْلَ الْكِتَابِ لَمْ تَكُفُرُونَ بِآيَاتِ اللَّهِ وَأَنْتُمْ تَشْهُدُونَ

آل عمران 70

"O People of the Book, why do you disbelieve in the aayaat of Allah while you bear witness?" [TMQ Al-Imran: 70].

And:

وَيَكُفِّرُهُمْ وَقَوْلِهِمْ عَلَىٰ مَرِيمَ بُهْتَانًا عَظِيمًا

السَّاءَ 156

"And because of their disbelief and uttering a grave falsehood (buhtan) against Mary" [TMQ An-Nisa: 156].

And:

لَقَدْ كَفَرَ الَّذِينَ قَالُوا إِنَّ اللَّهَ ثَالِثُ ثَلَاثَةٍ

النَّادِيَة 76

"Surely they disbelieve who say: 'Allah is the third of three'" [TMQ Al-Mai'dah: 76].

And:

قَاتَلُوا الَّذِينَ لَا يُؤْمِنُونَ بِاللَّهِ وَلَا بِالْيَوْمِ الْآخِرِ وَلَا يُحِرِّمُونَ مَا حَرَّمَ اللَّهُ
وَرَسُولُهُ وَلَا يَدِينُونَ دِينَ الْحَقِّ مِنَ الَّذِينَ أَوْتُوا الْكِتَابَ حَتَّىٰ يُعْطُوُا الْحِزْبَةَ

عَنْ يَدِ وَهُمْ صَاغِرُونَ التَّوبَة 29

"Fight those who believe not in Allah and the Last Day, nor forbid what Allah and His Messenger forbid nor follow the deen of truth among the People of the Book until they pay the jizyah readily and subdued" [TMQ At-Taubah: 29].

And:

هُوَ الَّذِي أَخْرَجَ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا مِنْ أَهْلِ الْكِتَابِ مِنْ دِيَارِهِمْ لِأَوْلَى الْحَسْنَى
الحضر 2

"He it is Who drove out those who disbelieve among the People of the Book from their homes at the first gathering" [TMQ Al-Hashr: 2]. Thus they are disbelievers (*kuffar*), and they are non-Muslims. It is not permitted to designate them as Muslims. Islam linguistically means submission (*inqiyad*) and in the *Shari'ah* technical terminology, it means the *deen* that Allah subhanahu revealed upon Muhammad ﷺ. If it is permitted to designate Islam with its linguistic meanings upon the previous Prophets (as) and upon those who believed and followed them before the mission of Muhammad ﷺ and before distortion (of their books), it is not permitted to do that after his ﷺ mission. So whoever does not believe in him and his message is a *kafir*, and it is not allowed that he be called Muslim or a believer (*mu'min*). He ta'ala said:

وَقُلْ لِلَّذِينَ أُوتُوا الْكِتَابَ وَالْأَمِينَ أَسْلَمُتُمْ فَإِنَّ أَسْلَمُوا فَقَدْ اهْتَدُوا وَإِنْ
تَوَلُّوْا فَإِنَّمَا عَلَيْكَ الْبَلَاغُ وَاللَّهُ بَصِيرٌ بِالْعِبَادِ
آل عمران 20

"And say to those given the Book and the illiterate (Arab pagans): 'Do you submit yourselves (in Islam)?' If they become Muslims, they are guided, and if they turn away, your duty is only the conveyance. And Allah is Seer of His slaves" [TMQ Al-Imran: 20]. And he ﷺ said:

وَالَّذِي نَفْسُ مُحَمَّدٍ يَدْهُ لَا يَسْمَعُ بِي أَهْمَدُ مِنْ هَذِهِ الْأُمَّةِ يَهُودِيٌّ وَلَا
نَصْرَانِيٌّ ثُمَّ يَمُوتُ وَلَمْ يُؤْمِنْ بِالَّذِي أُرْسِلْتُ بِهِ إِلَّا كَانَ مِنْ أَصْحَابِ
النَّارِ

"By the One in whose hand is Muhammad's soul, none hears of me of this Ummah, Jew or Christian, then dies without believing in what I was sent with except he is of the denizens of the Fire." And ibn Hibban extracted from the *hadith* of Anas that Caesar wrote to

the Messenger of Allah ﷺ: 'I am a Muslim' and the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said when he read the letter:

كَذَبَ عَدُوُّ اللَّهِ لَيْسَ مُسْلِمٌ وَهُوَ عَلَى النَّصْرَانِيَّةِ

"The enemy of Allah lied. He is not a Muslim while he is upon Christianity."

Amr Musa, Secretary-General of the Arab League, made clear that he does not believe that there is a civilisation better than (another) civilisation, and from the meaning of his words is that the Islamic civilisation is not preferable to the Capitalist, Hindu or Jewish civilisation for he says: "We do not believe that there is a better civilisation" in the exposition of his refutation of the Italian Prime Minister Berlusconi. One of them attempted to use as evidence for accepting the other as they are without restriction or condition, and without attempting to pronounce judgments against him, the *aayaat* of *Surat Al-Kahf* that say: "Religious dialogue is the attempt of the individual encumbered with the values, conventions, beliefs and previous creeds to discover the other (of a different religion) - as he is - and understand him and crystallize a philosophical formal view towards him without resorting to pronouncing prejudiced value judgments against him...the supporters of religious dialogue raised the motto of sincere intention. So he assumes the divestment of conditions and goals except the desire to understand the other and view him intellectually...The content of dialogue does not, in principle, differ with the tale with which the Noble Qur'an brought in *Surat Al-Kahf* (*aayaat* 32-42) about the dialogue between two men. Allah gave one of them two gardens of grapes surrounded by palm trees and with crops in the middle, rivers flowing therein; and Allah increased its owner over the other in property and children. The tale reveals that the dialogue took place between the two men without condition or restriction, and the Qur'an brought it with its complete details; and despite it's including the *kufr* of one of them in Allah, the other did not interrupt the dialogue because of it. Likewise the Qur'an did not refrain from mentioning the sayings of *kufr*; because in their totality they are able to build and formulate the intellectual examination of the personality disbelieving in Allah 'azza wa jalla...Religious dialogue differs from comparative religion and religious competition even if these concepts commingle in the literature. Comparative religion is a science

meaning study of a religion in comparison with others upon the level of the creed ("aqeedah), legislation and ritual worships, and its views about man, the universe and life and the like, of assuming objectivity and the possibility of eliminating prejudice. Whereas religious competition is a process aiming to prove the superiority and distinction of one religion over the other; a matter which is not of course aimed by religious dialogue which a process of understanding only" (Husam Tammam, researcher and journalist, Egypt: IslamOnline.net, under the title: 'Religious Dialogue: A Human Necessity or world Conspiracy').

These quotations are necessary to know what the advocates of the idea of religious dialogue intend of this expression, which is their technical terminology. The best of what guides us to the meaning of this technical terminology is what they themselves say or write, since the linguistic meaning does not benefit here. From all of these quotations, it is possible to crystallize the meaning of this technical terminology in the following:

Firstly: Equality and equivalence between religions and civilisations, and non-preference between a religion and another or a civilisation and another.

Secondly: Accepting the other as it is and discovering it without pronouncing judgments against it, but rather understanding and recognizing its views without restriction or condition.

Thirdly: The objective of dialogue between civilisations is interaction to create an alternative superior civilisation through the means of seeking to find out what is common and human; a matter that leads to the advance and flourishing of civilisations, and spreading of peace. The objective of dialogue between religions is to prevent Islam from entering the arena of the struggle.

All these concepts completely contradict Islam. There is not a single concept from these that has evidence or probable evidence. They are not from Islam; rather they are all distortion (tamweeh) and deception, and their danger against Islam is sure.

The Idea of Equality between Civilisations

The meaning of equality between religions and between civilisations is a *kufr* concept since it is an invitation to equality between the truth (*haqq*) and falsehood (*batil*), between the *deen* of truth and distorted religions, between *kufr* and *iman*, between misguidance (*dhalala*) and guidance, between the abrogating (*deen*) and the abrogated (*deen*), between civilisational concepts whose source is revelation and civilisational concepts laid down by man i.e. between the mind and text (*naql*), between arbitrating to *At-Taghut* and arbitrating to the Book and *Sunnah* and what they both guide to, between the confirmed (*thabit*) that benefits mankind and remains in the earth and the vanishing foam that is scum. The evidences for that are difficult to limit. He ta'ala said:

بَلْ نَقْذِفُ بِالْحَقِّ عَلَى الْبَاطِلِ فَيَدْمَغُهُ فَإِذَا هُوَ زَاهِقٌ {21:18}

"Nay We fling the truth (*haqq*) against the falsehood (*batil*) so it destroys it. And, behold, it is vanished!" [TMQ Al-Anbiya: 18].

And He said:

فَمَاذَا بَعْدَ الْحَقِّ إِلَّا الضَّلَالُ {10:32}

"What is there after the truth except misguidance?" [TMQ Yunus: 32].

And He said:

يُرِيدُونَ أَنْ يَتَحَكَّمُوا إِلَى الطَّاغُوتِ وَقَدْ أُمِرُوا أَنْ يَكُفُرُوا بِهِ وَيُرِيدُ
الشَّيْطَانُ أَنْ يُضْلِلَهُمْ ضَلَالًا بَعِيدًا

النساء 60

"They wish to arbitrate to *At-Taghut* while they have been commanded to deny it. And Satan wishes to mislead them far astray!" [TMQ An-Nisa: 60].

And He said:

هُوَ الَّذِي أَرْسَلَ رَسُولَهُ بِالْهُدَىٰ وَدِينُ الْحَقِّ لِيُظَهِّرَهُ عَلَى الَّذِينَ كُلُّهُمْ لَوْ
كَرَهُ الْمُشْرِكُونَ {9:33}

"He is the One who sent His Messenger with the guidance and the deen of truth so that it prevails over all other deens, even if the polytheists detest!" [TMQ At-Taubah: 33].

And He said:

وَمَن يَتَّسِعُ غَيْرُ الْإِسْلَامِ دِيَنًا فَلَن يُقْبَلَ مِنْهُ وَهُوَ فِي الْآخِرَةِ مِنَ الْخَاسِرِينَ

آل عمران 85

"And whoever seeks other than Islam as a deen, never will it be accepted from him. And in the Hereafter he will be among the losers" [TMQ Al-Imran: 85].

And He said:

وَأَنْزَلْنَا إِلَيْكَ الْكِتَابَ بِالْحَقِّ مُصَدِّقًا لِمَا بَيْنَ يَدِيهِ مِنَ الْكِتَابِ وَمَهِمَّتْ عَلَيْهِ

المائدة 48

"And We revealed to you the Book in truth confirming the Scripture that came before it and dominating over it" [TMQ Al-Mai'dah: 48].

And He said:

كَذَلِكَ يَضْرِبُ اللَّهُ الْحَقُّ وَالْبَاطِلُ فَمَمَّا زَرَبَ فَيَدْهَبُ جُفَاءً وَمَمَّا مَا يَنْفَعُ
النَّاسَ فَيَمْكُثُ فِي الْأَرْضِ كَذَلِكَ يَضْرِبُ اللَّهُ الْأَمْثَالُ {13:17}

"Thus does Allah show forth truth from falsehood (by parables). Then as for the foam, it passes away as scum while that which benefits mankind remains in the earth. Thus Allah sets forth parables" [TMQ Ar-Rad: 17].

And He said:

فَمَنْ كَانَ مُؤْمِنًا كَمَنْ كَانَ فَاسِقًا لَا يَسْتُوْنَ {32:18}

"Is then he who is a believer like he who is a transgressor (fasiq)? They are not equal" [TMQ As-Sajdah: 18].

And He said:

قُلْ لَا يَسْتُوْيِ الْخَيْرُ وَالْطَّيْبُ وَلَاْ أَعْجَبَكَ كَثْرَةُ الْخَيْرِ فَاقْتُلُوا اللَّهَ يَا
أُولَئِكَ الْأَلْبَابُ لَعَلَّكُمْ تُفْلِحُونَ المائدة 100

"Say: 'Not equal are the evil and the good, even though the abundance of evil

pleases you.' Fear Allah, O men of understanding, so that you may be successful" [TMQ Al-Mai'dah: 100].

And He said:

مَثْلُ الْفَرِيقَيْنِ كَالْأَعْمَى وَالْأَصْمَمِ وَالْبَصِيرِ وَالسَّمِيعِ هَلْ يَسْتَوِيَانِ مَثَلًاً أَفَلَا
تَذَكَّرُونَ {11:24}

"The likeness of the two parties is as the blind and deaf, and the seer and hearer. Are the two equal when compared? Will you not then take heed?" [TMQ Hud: 24].

And He said:

وَدُوَا لَوْ تَكْفُرُونَ كَمَا كَفَرُوا فَتَكُونُونَ سَوَاءَ النَّسَاءُ 89

"They wish you disbelief as they disbelief so that you become equal" [TMQ An-Nisa: 89].

How strange for the one claiming Islam, then he equalises between Islam and *kufr*, between atheism (*ilhad*) and trinity and *tawheed*, between the denier of the Prophethood of Muhammad ﷺ and the believer in it, between permitting *riba* and forbidding it, between the worship of Allah ﷺ and worshipping creatures, between fornication and marriage, between permitting homosexuality and forbidding lesbianism and homosexuality, between the pig and dates. It is even more strange; the one who remains silent and says nothing about preference and does not prefer *tawheed* to polytheism, *halal* to *haram*, the *Shar'a* to *At-Taghut*, the believer to the *kafir*, revelation to man-made, Islam to the remaining deens, the Qur'an to the distorted Books, worshipping the Creator to worshipping the sun, the cow and the stars. May Allah save us from *fitnah*! Subordination (*tab'iyya*) is rejected, equality is rejected, and remaining about the preference of Islam and its civilisation over the remaining religions and civilisations is rejected.

The Idea of Accepting the Other

As for accepting the other, in order to merely know his opinions, without pronouncing judgments against him, and without refuting what he says, is not of the Islamic method whatsoever. Rather, what the Book indicates is completely contradictory to that. When the Noble Qur'an

mentions the thoughts and statements of *kuffar*; it always follows them with what is the truth, thus refuting them. Examples of this are:

وَقَالُوا اتَّخَذَ الرَّحْمَنُ وَلَدًا لَقَدْ جِئْنُ شَيْئًا إِذَا تَكَادُ السَّمَاوَاتُ يَنْفَطِرُونَ
مِنْهُ وَتَنْشَقُ الْأَرْضُ وَتَخْرُجُ الْجَبَالُ هَذَا أَنْ دَعَوْا لِلرَّحْمَنِ وَلَدًا وَمَا يَنْبَغِي
لِلرَّحْمَنِ أَنْ يَتَخَذَ وَلَدًا { 19 : 88-92 }

"They say: 'Ar-Rahmaan has begotten a child.' Indeed you have brought forth a terrible evil thing! Whereby the heavens are almost torn down, the earth split asunder and the mountains fall in ruin. That they ascribe a child to Ar-Rahmaan. And it is not suitable for Ar-Rahmaan to beget a child" [TMQ Maryam: 88-92].

And:

وَيَقُولُونَ مَتَى هَذَا الْوَعْدُ إِنْ كُنْتُمْ صَادِقِينَ لَوْ يَعْلَمُ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا حِينَ لَا
يَكُفُونَ عَنْ وُجُوهِهِمُ الظَّارِفَةِ وَلَا عَنْ ظُهُورِهِمْ وَلَا هُمْ يُنْصَرُونَ بَلْ تُأْتِهِمْ
بَعْثَةً فَتَبَهَّهُمْ فَلَا يَسْتَطِعُونَ رَدَّهَا وَلَا هُمْ يُنْظَرُونَ { 21:38 - 40 }

"And they say: 'When will this promise (come to pass), if you are truthful?' If only those who disbelieved knew when they will not be able to ward off the Fire from their faces nor their backs. Nor will they be helped. Nay, it will come upon them suddenly and perplex them. And they will have no power to avert it nor will they get respite" [TMQ Al-Anbiya: 38-40].

And:

وَإِذْ قُلْتُمْ يَا مُوسَى لَنْ تُؤْمِنَ لَكَ حَتَّى نَرَى اللَّهَ جَهَرًا فَأَخَذَنَّكُمُ الصَّاعِدَةَ
وَأَنْتُمْ تَنْظُرُونَ البقرة 55

"And when you said: 'O Musa, we shall never believe in you until we see Allah plainly.' And you were seized with a thunder bolt while you were looking" [TMQ Al-Baqarah: 55].

And:

وَإِذَا قِيلَ لَهُمْ آمَنُوا بِمَا أَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ قَالُوا تُؤْمِنُ بِمَا أَنْزَلَ عَلَيْنَا وَيَكْفُرُونَ بِمَا
وَرَاءَهُ وَهُوَ الْحَقُّ مُصَدِّقًا لِمَا مَعَهُمْ قُلْ فَلِمَ تَقْتُلُونَ أَنْبِياءَ اللَّهِ مِنْ قَبْلٍ إِنْ
كُنْتُمْ مُؤْمِنِينَ البقرة 91

"And when it was said to them: 'Believe in what Allah revealed', they said: 'We believe in what was revealed to us' and they disbelieve in what is after it while it is the truth confirming that which is with them. Say: 'Why then did you kill the Prophets of Allah aforetime if you were (indeed) believers?'" [TMQ Al-Baqarah: 91].

And:

وَقَالُوا لَنْ يَدْخُلَ الْجَنَّةَ إِلَّا مَنْ كَانَ هُودًا أَوْ نَصَارَى تَلْكَ أَمَانِيْهُمْ قُلْ هَاتُوا
بُرْهَانَكُمْ إِنْ كُنْتُمْ صَادِقِينَ *بَلَى مَنْ أَسْلَمَ وَجْهَهُ لِلَّهِ وَهُوَ مُحْسِنٌ فَلَهُ أَجْرُهُ
عِنْدَ رَبِّهِ وَلَا خَوْفٌ عَلَيْهِمْ وَلَا هُمْ يَخْزُنُونَ

البقرة 112-111

"And they say: 'None shall enter Paradise except he be a Jew or Christian.' Those are their desires. Say: 'Produce your proof if you are truthful.' Rather whoever submits his face to Allah and is a doer of good, his reward is with Allah. Such will not fear nor will they grieve" [TMQ Al-Baqarah: 111-112].

And:

وَقَالُوا اتَّخَذَ اللَّهُ وَلَدًا سُبْحَانَهُ بَلْ لَهُ مَا فِي السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ كُلُّ لَهُ
قَاتُلُونَ البقرة 116

"And they say: 'Allah has begotten a child.' Glory be to Him! Nay, to Him belongs all that is in the heavens and the earth. All surrender to Him with obedience" [TMQ Al-Baqarah: 116].

And:

وَقَالُوا كُونُوا هُودًا أَوْ نَصَارَى تَهْتَدُوا قُلْ بَلْ مِلَّةُ إِبْرَاهِيمَ نِيفَا وَمَا كَانَ مِنِ
الْمُشْرِكِينَ الْبَرْقَةُ 135

"And they say: 'Be Jews or Christians (then) you will be guided.' Say: 'Nay, the creed of Ibrahim, and he was not of the polytheists'" [TMQ Al-Baqarah: 135].

And:

أَلَمْ تَرِ إِلَى الَّذِي حَاجَ إِبْرَاهِيمَ فِي رَبِّهِ أَنْ آتَاهُ اللَّهُ الْمُلْكَ إِذْ قَالَ إِبْرَاهِيمُ
رَبِّي الَّذِي يُحِيِّي وَيُمِيتُ قَالَ أَنَا أُحْيِي وَأُمِيتُ قَالَ إِبْرَاهِيمُ فِيَنَّ اللَّهَ
يَأْتِي بِالشَّمْسِ مِنَ الْمَسْرِقِ فَأَتَ بِهَا مِنَ الْمَغْرِبِ فَبَهَتَ الَّذِي كَفَرَ وَاللَّهُ
لَا يَهْدِي الْقَوْمَ الظَّالِمِينَ الْبَرْقَةُ 258

"Have you not considered about he who disputed with Ibrahim about his Lord because Allah had given him the kingdom? When Ibrahim said to him: 'My Lord is He who gives life and causes death.' He said: 'I give life and cause death.' Ibrahim said: 'Verily Allah causes the sun to rise in the east thus you cause it to rise in the west.' Thus the disbeliever was utterly defeated. And Allah guides not the unjust folk" [TMQ Al-Baqarah: 258]. Even though this ayah was of the Shar'a of those before us, however it commenced with His ﷺ saying subhanahu:

الَّذِينَ قَالُوا لِإِخْرَانِهِمْ وَقَعُدُوا لَوْ أَطَاعُوْنَا مَا قُتْلُوا قُلْ فَادْرُوْا عَنْ أَنْفُسِكُمْ
الْمَوْتَ إِنْ كُنْتُمْ صَادِقِينَ آلِ عَمَّارٍ 168

"Those who said about their brothers while they sat (at home): 'Had they obeyed us, they would not have been killed.' Say: 'Avert death from yourselves if you speak the truth!'" [TMQ Al-Imran: 168].

And:

الَّذِينَ قَالُوا إِنَّ اللَّهَ عَهْدُ إِلَيْنَا أَلَا نُؤْمِنْ لِرَسُولِ اللَّهِ حَتَّىٰ يَأْتِيَنَا بِقُرْبَانِ تَأْكُلُهُ
النَّارُ قُلْ قَدْ جَاءَكُمْ رُسُلٌ مِّنْ قَبْلِي بِالْبَيِّنَاتِ وَبِالَّذِي قُلْتُمْ فَلَمْ قَتْلُتُمُوهُمْ إِنْ
كُنْتُمْ صَادِقِينَ آلِ عَمَّارٍ 183

"Those who said: 'Verily Allah has taken our promise not to believe in any Messenger unless he brings to us an offering which fire devours.' Say: 'There came to you Messengers before me with clear proofs and with what you speak of. Why then did you kill them if you are truthful?'" [TMQ Al-Imran: 183].

And:

وَقَالَتِ الْيَهُودُ يَدُ اللَّهِ مَغْلُولَةٌ غُلْتُ أَيْدِيهِمْ وَلَعْنُوا بِمَا قَالُوا بَلْ يَدَاهُ
مَبْسُطَتَانِ يُفْقَرُ كَيْفَ يَشَاءُ الْمَائِدَةُ 64

"And the Jews say: 'Allah's hand is tied up!' Be their hands tied up and be they accursed for what they say! Nay, both His hands are widely outstretched. He spends as He wishes" [TMQ Al-Mai'dah: 64].

And:

سَيَقُولُ الَّذِينَ أَشْرَكُوا لَوْ شَاءَ اللَّهُ مَا أَشْرَكْنَا وَلَا آبَاؤُنَا وَلَا حَرَمَنَا مِنْ
شَيْءٍ كَذَّلِكَ كَذَّبَ الَّذِينَ مِنْ قَبْلِهِمْ حَتَّىٰ ذَاقُوا بِأَسْنَانِ قُلْ هَلْ عِنْدَكُمْ مِنْ
عِلْمٍ فَتَخْرِجُوهُ لَنَا إِنْ تَتَّبِعُونَ إِلَّا الظَّنُّ وَإِنْ أَنْتُمْ إِلَّا تَحْرُصُونَ {6:148}

"Those who associate (with Allah) will say: 'If Allah had willed, we would not have associated nor would we have forbidden anything.' Likewise belied those before them until they tasted Our wrath. Say: 'Have you any knowledge so that you produce it for us? Verily you follow nothing but conjecture (dhann) and you do nothing but lie" [TMQ Al-An'am: 148].

And:

وَقَالَتِ الْيَهُودُ عَرَبِيْرُ ابْنُ اللَّهِ وَقَالَتِ النَّصَارَى الْمَسِيْحُ ابْنُ اللَّهِ ذَلِكَ
قَوْلُهُمْ بِأَفْوَاهِهِمْ يُضَاهُوْنَ قَوْلَ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُواْ مِنْ قَبْلِ قَاتَلُهُمُ اللَّهُ أَكْبَرُ
يُؤْفَكُوْنَ * اتَّخَذُواْ أَحْبَارَهُمْ وَرُهْبَانَهُمْ أَرْبَابًا مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ وَالْمَسِيْحِ ابْنِ
مَرْيَمَ وَمَا أُمْرُوْا إِلَّا لِيَعْبُدُوْا إِلَهًا وَاحِدًا لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا هُوَ سُبْحَانُهُ عَمَّا
يُشْرِكُوْنَ يُشْرِكُوْنَ التَّوْبَةَ 30-31

"And the Jews say: 'Uzayr is the son of Allah' and the Christians say: 'The Messiah is the son of Allah.' That is their saying from their mouths. They imitate the saying of those who disbelieved of old. Allah's curse is upon them, how they lie! They took their rabbis and monks as lords besides Allah and the Messiah son of Mary while they were not commanded save to worship one Lord. There is no god but He. Glorified is He beyond what they associate!" [TMQ At-Taubah: 30-1].

And:

وَإِذَا تُنْتَلِي عَلَيْهِمْ آيَاتِنَا يَسِيَّنَاتِ قَالَ الَّذِينَ لَا يَرْجُونَ لِقَاءَنَا أَتْ بِقُرْآنَ غَيْرَ
هَذَا أَوْ بَدَلْهُ قُلْ مَا يَكُونُ لِي أَنْ أَبْدِلَهُ مِنْ تِلْقَاءِنَفْسِي إِنْ أَتَّبِعُ إِلَّا مَا
يُوحَى إِلَيَّ إِنِّي أَخَافُ إِنْ عَصَيْتُ رَبِّي عَذَابَ يَوْمٍ عَظِيمٍ قُلْ لَوْ شَاءَ اللَّهُ مَا
تَلَوَّهُ عَلَيْكُمْ وَلَا أَدْرَاكُمْ بِهِ فَقَدْ لَبِثْنِيْكُمْ عُمُراً مِنْ قَبْلِهِ أَفَلَا تَعْقِلُوْنَ
{10:15-16}

"And when Our dear aayaat are recited to them, those who expect not meeting Us say: 'Bring us a Qur'an other than this or change it.' Say: 'It is not for me to change it of my own accord. I only follow that which was revealed unto Me. Verily I fear, if I disobey my Lord, the punishment of a Great Day.' Say: 'If Allah had so willed, I should not have recited it to you nor would He have made it known to you, I had stayed among you a lifetime before this. Have you then no sense?'" [TMQ Yunus: 15-6].

And:

وَقَالُوا مَا هِيَ إِلَّا حَيَاتُنَا الدُّنْيَا تَمُوتُ وَتَحْبِيْنَا وَمَا يُهْلِكُنَا إِلَّا الدَّهْرُ وَمَا لَهُمْ
بِذَلِكَ مِنْ عِلْمٍ إِنْ هُمْ إِلَّا يَظْنُونَ وَإِذَا تُنْتَلِي عَلَيْهِمْ آيَاتِنَا بَيِّنَاتٍ مَا كَانَ
حُجَّتُهُمْ إِلَّا أَنْ قَالُوا اتَّوْا بِآيَاتِنَا إِنْ كُنْتُمْ صَادِقِينَ قُلِ اللَّهُ يُحِسِّنُكُمْ ثُمَّ
يُمِيْتُكُمْ ثُمَّ يَجْمِعُكُمْ إِلَى يَوْمِ الْقِيَامَةِ لَا رَيْبَ فِيهِ وَلَكِنَّ أَكْثَرَ النَّاسِ لَا
يَعْلَمُونَ {45:24-6}

"And they say: 'There is nothing but our life of this world, we die and we live and nothing destroys us except time. They have no knowledge of it, they only conjecture. And when Our clear aayaat are recited to them, their argument is not other than that they say: 'Bring back our fathers if you are truthful.' Say: 'Allah gives you life then causes you to die, then He will assemble you on the Day of Resurrection about which there is no doubt but most of mankind know not'" [TMQ Al-Jathiya: 24-6]. Even the aayaat of Surah Al-Kahf, which one of them used as evidence, does not depart from this style of refuting the concept or concepts of *kufr*. Nor is the dialogue, as they say, a mere intellectual process only; rather it is understanding and refuting the concepts of *kufr*. This is clear in the rebuke of the companion, rejecting the *kufr* of one of the two, saying:

كَفَرْتَ بِالَّذِي خَلَقْتَ مِنْ ثُرَابٍ ثُمَّ مِنْ نُطْفَةٍ ثُمَّ مِنْ سَوَّاكَ رَجُلًا لَكِنَّا هُوَ اللَّهُ
رَبِّي وَلَا أُشْرِكُ بِرَبِّي أَحَدًا وَلَوْلَا إِذْ دَخَلْتَ جَنَّتَكَ قُلْتَ مَا شَاءَ اللَّهُ لَا فُوْرَةَ
إِلَّا بِاللَّهِ إِنْ تُرَنَّ أَنَا أَقْلَلُ مِنْكَ مَا لَا وَلَا دَأْ فَعْسَى رَبِّي أَنْ يُؤْتِينَ خَيْرًا مِنْ
جَنَّتِكَ وَيُرْسِلَ عَلَيْهَا حُسْبَانًا مِنَ السَّمَاءِ فَتَصْبِحَ صَعِيدًا زَلَقًا أَوْ يُصْبِحَ
مَأْوَهَا غَورًا فَلَنْ تَسْتَطِعَ لَهُ طَلَبًا {18:37-41}

"Do you disbelieve in He who created you dust then out of a (nutfah) then fashioned you a man? But as for me, He is Allah my Lord and none shall I associate with my Lord. Had you, when you entered your garden, only said: 'Whatever Allah wills (will occur), there is no power except with Allah.' If you see me less than you in property and children, perhaps my Lord will give me better than your garden and send upon it a (husband) from the sky, then it will be a slippery earth. Or its water

becomes deep sunken so that you will not be able to seek it" [TMQ Al-Kahf: 37-41]. So how can it be said that the companion did not pronounce judgment while he rebukes him saying: 'Do you disbelieve in He who created you?' then he directs him to what is obliged upon him to say namely: 'Whatever Allah wills, there is no power except with Allah.' Then he explained to him the power of the All-Capable (*Al-Qadir*) Creator to send the bolt (from heaven) and make the water disappear. So how can it be said that this is a model of religious dialogue without restriction or condition, without pronouncing judgements and accepting the other as he is??!!

As for the one using as evidence His ﷺ saying:

فُلْ يَا أَيُّهَا الْكَافِرُونَ لَا أَعْبُدُ مَا تَعْبُدُونَ وَلَا أَنْتُمْ عَابِدُونَ مَا أَعْبُدُ
{109:1-3}

"Say: 'O you disbelievers! I do not worship that which you worship. And you do not worship what I worship'" [TMQ Al-Kafirun: 1-3] for dialogue with disbelievers (*kafireen*) and His ﷺ saying:

وَإِنْ أَحَدٌ مِّنَ الْمُشْرِكِينَ إِسْتَجَارَكَ فَاجْرِهُ حَتَّىٰ يَسْمَعَ
كَلَامَ اللَّهِ ثُمَّ أَبْلَغُهُ مَأْمَنَةً {9:6}

"If one of the polytheists seeks your protection, grant him protection until he hears the word of Allah then escort him to a place of safety" [TMQ At-Taubah: 6] for dialogue with polytheists; this is an incorrect deduction and outside its context. *Surat Al-Kafirun* has pronounced a judgment against them, which is that they are *kuffar* and will remain upon their *kufr* without ever believing. Allah subhanahu knew that they would never believe ever and He informed the Messenger of Allah ﷺ about that. He commanded him to convey it to them and to reject their offer of mutual exchange of deities yearly. So there remains no place for dialogue whatsoever after Allah subhanahu informed that they would remain disbelievers until death. This *Surah* descended regarding specific people. Allah spoke the truth. Some of them died and some of them were killed; and none of them believed.

As for His ﷺ saying:

وَإِنْ أَحَدٌ مِّنَ الْمُشْرِكِينَ إِسْتَجَارَكَ فَاجْرِهُ حَتَّىٰ يَسْمَعَ
كَلَامَ اللَّهِ ثُمَّ أَبْلَغُهُ مَأْمَنَةً {9:6}

"If one of the polytheists seeks your protection, grant him protection until he hears the word of Allah then escort him to a place of safety" [TMQ At-Taubah: 6]. There is no evidence in this *ayah* for what they claim about dialogue between equals. There is no indication therein for dialogue; rather therein is a command to make the polytheist hear the word of Allah, and either he believes or he is escorted to his place of safety. So the *ayah* is about giving protection to the polytheist who wishes to ask about Islam, so Islam is explained to him in a way that is hoped he will embrace it. There is no evidence in the *ayah* for dialogue in order to know his opinions in the way of equality and equivalence without pronouncing judgement against him. The *ayah* determines that he is a polytheist, so it pronounced judgement of polytheism. It does not seek a dialogue with him to know his opinions; rather it seeks making him listen to the Qur'an. So there is no sense in using it as evidence.

The Idea of the Alternative Civilisation

What caps the matter is their saying that the objective of dialogue between civilisations is interaction to create an alternative superior civilisation through the method of seeking to find what is common between the civilisations. This, in turn, leads to progress, flourishing and spreading peace. How bad is the deduction of this concept by someone using His ﷺ saying:

يَا أَهْلَ الْكِتَابِ تَعَالَوْا إِلَىٰ كَلْمَةٍ سَوَاءٍ بَيْنَنَا وَبَيْنُكُمْ لَا تَعْبُدُ إِلَّا اللَّهُ وَلَا
تُشْرِكُ بِهِ شَيْئاً وَلَا يَتَحَذَّرَ بَعْضُنَا بَعْضًا أَرْبَابًا

آل عمران 64

"Say: 'O People of the Book. Come to a just word between us: That we worship none but Allah nor associate anything with Him nor some of us taking each other as lords'. [TMQ Al-Imran:64]. So he says: "This is a dialogue with others from a position of equality." Then he interprets His ﷺ saying: "To a just word" into the word "common (*mushtarak*) between us" (and) "we do not

say we dialogue to (reach) to our word." This understanding of the *ayah* is slandering upon Allah, as the meaning of 'sawaa' is just ('*adl*), i.e. a just word which what the *ayah* explains subsequently. There is nothing in the *ayah*, whether in its wording or its meaning, that indicates we invite them to a common word. He definitely did not intend that we associate in a just word by the evidence of his saying: "We do not say that we dialogue to our word" so nothing remains except that he wants the common civilisation. The call to interaction and seeking to find what is common between the civilisations is mixing the truth with falsehood; Allah prohibited the People of the Book from this, and also Muslims by greater reason. He ta'ala said:

يَا أَهْلَ الْكِتَابِ لَمْ تَلْبِسُونَ الْحَقَّ بِالْبَاطِلِ وَتَكْتُمُونَ الْحَقُّ أَنْتُمْ تَعْلَمُونَ
آل عمران 71

"O People of the Book, why do you mix the truth with falsehood while you know?" [TMQ Al-Imran: 71].

After we have clarified their intention from the dialogue between religions and dialogue between civilisations, and their objective of this dialogue, we move onto the issue of clash in its various types, economic, intellectual, military and political.

The Clash between Civilisations

The History of the Clash between Islam and other Civilisations

The clash/struggle (*sira'a*) between religions and civilisations is ancient, and what concerns us is the clash between Islam and other religions and civilisations. The truth is that Islam is a *deen* of struggle from the time when Muhammad ﷺ was commanded to come out openly with the truth until the Hour is established. When he ﷺ was ordered to speak out openly what he was commanded, the intellectual struggle commenced between the concepts of Islam and the concepts of *kufr*. This intellectual struggle has continued until our time. It has not stopped nor is it allowed to stop, despite what was added to it of other types of struggle. The intellectual struggle is refuting thoughts with sharp styles, and with intensity and harshness. The Messenger ﷺ performed it in execution of the command of Allah. So he would say:

إِنَّكُمْ وَمَا تَعْبُدُونَ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ حَصَبٌ جَهَنَّمَ أَنْتُمْ لَهَا وَارِدُونَ {21:98}

"Verily you and what you worship besides Allah are fuel for the Hellfire! Surely you will enter it" [TMQ Al-Anbiya: 98].

And:

هَمَّازٌ مَّشَاءِ بِنَمِيمٍ مَّنَاعٍ لِّلْخَيْرِ مُعْتَدٌ أَتَيْمٍ عُتْلٌ بَعْدَ ذَلِكَ زَيْمٍ {68:11-13}

"A slanderer, going about with calumnies. A hinderer of good, transgressor, sinful. Cruel, after all that, base-born" [TMQ Al-Qalam: 11-3].

And:

ثُمَّ إِنَّكُمْ أَيُّهَا الصَّالُونَ الْمُكَذِّبُونَ لَا كُلُونَ مِنْ شَجَرٍ مِّنْ رَّقْوِمٍ فَمَالَوْنَ مِنْهَا الْبَطْوُنَ فَشَارِبُونَ عَلَيْهِ مِنَ الْحَمِيمِ فَشَارِبُونَ شُرْبَ الْهَمِيمِ هَذَا نُوَلُّهُمْ يَوْمَ الْدِينِ تَحْنُ حَلْقَاتِكُمْ فَلَوْلَا تُصَدِّقُونَ {56:51-57}

"Then, verily, you misguided, deniers. You will surely eat of the tree of Zaqqum. Then you will fill bellies therewith. Drink boiling water on top of it. So you will drink the drinking of thirsty camels. That will be their entertainment on the Day of Recompense! We created you, so why do you not believe?" [TMQ Al-Waqi'a: 51-7].

And:

إِنَّ الْمُجْرِمِينَ فِي ضَلَالٍ وَسُعْرٍ {54: 47}

"Verily the criminals are in misguidance and will burn!" [TMQ Al-Qamar: 47]

And:

ثُمَّ نَبْتَهِلْ فَنَجْعَلُ لَعْنَةَ اللَّهِ عَلَى الْكَادِيْنَ آل عمران 61

"Then we pray and invoke the curse of Allah upon the deniers" [TMQ Al-Imran: 61].

And:

تَبَّتْ يَدَا أَبِي لَهَبٍ وَتَبَّ {111:1}

"Perish the hands of Abu Lahab and he has perished" [TMQ Al-Masad: 1].

And:

إِنَّ شَانِكَ هُوَ الْأَبْتُرُ {108:3}

"Verily the one who makes you angry will be cut off" [TMQ Al-Kauthar: 3].

This intellectual struggle does not contradict with His ﷺ saying:

ادْعُ إِلَى سَبِيلِ رَبِّكَ بِالْحِكْمَةِ وَالْمَوْعِظَةِ الْحَسَنَةِ وَجَادِلُهُمْ بِالَّتِي هِيَ أَحْسَنُ إِنَّ رَبَّكَ هُوَ أَعْلَمُ بِمَنْ ضَلَّ عَنْ سَبِيلِهِ وَهُوَ أَعْلَمُ بِالْمُهَتَّدِينَ {16:125}

"Invite to the way of your Lord with (hikma) and fair preaching. And argue with them with what is better. Verily your Lord knows best who has gone astray from His way and He knows best those who are guided." [TMQ Al-Nahl: 125] This is because the (hikma) here is the intellectual proof (burhan 'aql) and the irrefutable evidence (hujjat damigha); and the fair preaching is the beautiful reminder. The beautiful reminder is by impressing the thoughts and emotions collectively like His ﷺ saying:

إِنَّ جَهَنَّمَ كَانَتْ مِرْصَادًا لِلْطَّاغِينَ مَا بَأَلَّابِشَنَ فِيهَا أَحْقَابًا لَا يَذُوقُونَ فِيهَا بَرْدًا وَلَا شَرَابًا إِلَّا حَمِيمًا وَغَسَاقًا جَزَاءً وَفَاقًا {78: 21 - 26}

"Verily Hell is a place of ambush. A dwelling place for the transgressors. Abiding therein for ages. No cool shall they taste therein nor any drink. Except boiling water and dirty wound discharges. An exact recompense!" [TMQ An-Naba: 21-6]. The argument with what is better is avoiding the harm of the one arguing with you i.e. that you turn away from his insult to you. That is to say; you ignore him. Likewise there is no contradiction between the intellectual struggle and His ﷺ saying:

وَلَا تُجَادِلُوا أَهْلَ الْكِتَابِ إِلَّا بِالَّتِي هِيَ أَحْسَنُ إِلَّا الَّذِينَ ظَلَمُوا مِنْهُمْ {29:46}

"Argue not with the People of the Book except with that which is better except those who do wrong among them." [TMQ Al-Ankabut: 46] That which is better is to turn away from their harm to you in the argument. As for

those who do wrong through fighting or refusing the enforcement of the rule upon them and the paying of *jizyah*, arguing with them is by the sword. As an example of intellectual struggle narrated regarding Him ﷺ is what ibn Abi Sheeba and Abdurrazaq reported in their *Musnads*, as well as the writers of the *Seerah* and others, from Qatadah that "the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said to a man:

((أَسْلَمَ أَبَا الْحَارِثَ, فَقَالَ النَّصَارَى قَدْ أَسْلَمْتَ, فَقَالَ لَهُ أَسْلَمَ أَبَا الْحَارِثَ,
فَقَالَ قَدْ أَسْلَمْتَ, فَقَالَ لَهُ الْثَالِثَةُ أَسْلَمَ أَبَا الْحَارِثَ, فَقَالَ قَدْ أَسْلَكْتَ
قَبْلَكَ, فَغَضِبَ وَقَالَ كَذَبْتَ حَالَ بَيْنَكَ وَبَيْنَ الْإِسْلَامِ خَلَالَ ثَلَاثَ شَرِيكٍ
الْخَمْرِ وَلَمْ يَقُلْ شَرِيكٌ, وَأَكَلَكَ الْخَتَرِيرَ وَدَعَاكَ اللَّهَ وَلَدًا)).

'Embrace Islam, Abu Al-Harith.' The Christian said: 'I have embraced Islam.' So he said: '**'Embrace Islam, Abu Al-Harith.'**' The Christian said: 'I have embraced Islam.' So he said to him the third time: '**'Embrace Islam, Abu Al-Harith.'**' The Christian said: 'I have embraced Islam before you.' So he became angry and said: '**'you lie. Three matters barred between you and Islam: Your purchasing of wine (he did not say: 'Your drinking wine'), your eating the pig and your invoking a child for Allah.'**' And As-Sana'i reported in his 'Tafseer' from Abdurrazaq from Qatadah that Ubayy bin Khalaf came with a decaying tooth while scattering it in the wind and said: Will Allah give life to this, O Muhammad? The Prophet ﷺ said:

((نَعَمْ يَحْيِي اللَّهُ هَذَا وَيَمْتَكِ وَيَدْخُلُكَ النَّارَ))

"Yes, Allah will give life to it and cause you to die and enter you into the Fire!" And Al-Hakim reported in 'Al-Mustadrak' and authenticated it from Jabir bin Abdullah (ra) who said:

إِجْتَمَعَتْ قُرِيشٌ يَوْمًا فَأَتَاهُ عَتَّبَةُ بْنُ رَبِيعَةَ بْنُ عَبْدِ شَمْسٍ فَقَالَ : يَا مُحَمَّدَ
أَنْتَ خَيْرُ أَمْ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ؟ ... فَسَكَتَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.
فَقَالَ لَهُ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ أَفْرَغْتَ، قَالَ نَعَمْ، فَقَرَأَ رَسُولُ
اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ : {بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ} حَمْ * تَتَرَبَّلُ مِنَ
الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ} حَقِّ بَلْغٍ {فَإِنْ أَعْرَضُوا فَقُلْ أَنْذِرْنِّكُمْ صَاعِقَةً مُّثْلَّ

صَاعِقَةَ عَادٍ وَثَمُودَ} فَقَالَ لَهُ عَتْبَةُ: حَسْبُكَ حَسْبُكَ مَا عَنْكَ غَيْرُ هَذَا؟
 قَالَ: لَا, فَرَجَعَ عَتْبَةً إِلَى قَرْيَشٍ فَقَالُوا مَا وَرَاءُكَ؟ فَقَالَ: مَا تَرَكْتُ شَيْئًا
 أَرَى أَنْكُمْ تَكَلَّمُونَهُ إِلَّا قَدْ كَلَّنَتِهِ, قَالُوا: فَهَلْ أَجَابَكَ؟ قَالَ: نَعَمْ وَالَّذِي
 نَصَبَهَا بَنِيهَا مَا فَهَمْتُ شَيْئًا مَا قَالَ غَيْرُ أَنَّهُ أَنْذَرَكُمْ صَاعِقَةً مُثْلِّهِ
 وَثَمُودًا. قَالُوا: وَيَلْكَ يَكْلِمُكَ رَجُلٌ بِالْعَرَبِيَّةِ وَلَا تَدْرِي مَا قَالَ؟ قَالَ: لَا وَ
 اللَّهُ مَا فَهَمْتُ شَيْئًا مَا قَالَ غَيْرُ ذَكْرِ الصَّاعِقَةِ.

"Quraysh convened one day and Utbah bin Rabi'ah came to him and said: O Muhammad, are you better or Abdullah?...The Messenger of Allah ﷺ was silent. Then the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said: **Have you finished?** He said: Yes. So the Messenger of Allah ﷺ recited: 'Bismillah ir-Rahmaan ir-Raheem. Ha Meem. A revelation from Allah, ir-Rahmaan, ir-Raheem' until he reached: 'But if they turn away, then say: 'I have warned you of a lightning bold like the lightning bolt of 'Ad and Thamud' [TMQ Fussilat: 1-13] Utbah said to him: It is enough, it is enough. Have you anything other than this? He said: **No**. So he returned to Quraysh and they said: What is behind you? He said: I did not leave anything that I thought you would say to him except that I said to him. They said: Did he answer you? He said: Yes. By the One who set upright the structure, I understood nothing of what he said except that he warned you of a lightning bolt of 'Aad and Thamud. They said: Woe unto you, a man spoke to you in Arabic and you do not know what he said? He said: No, by Allah, I understood nothing except mentioning the lightning bolt." This is some of what was narrated from him ﷺ of intellectual struggle.

Likewise, some of the *Sahabah* would do this. Of this is what ibn Ishaq narrated with his chain from Az-Zubair who said: "The first to loudly recite the Qur'an in Makkah after the Messenger of Allah ﷺ was 'Abdullah bin Mas'oud (ra). He said: The companions of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ assembled one day and said: By Allah, the Quraysh have not heard the Qur'an being loudly recited yet, so which man will make them hear it? 'Abdullah bin Mas'oud said: Me. They said: Verily we fear them against you. We intend a person who has kinsfolk who protect him from

the people if they have evil designs upon him. He said: Leave me. Allah will protect me. He said: On the morrow, bin Mas'oud came to the *maqam* (of Ibrahim at the Ka'aba) in the forenoon and recited:

الرَّحْمَنُ عَلَمَ الْقُرْآنَ {55:1-2}

'Ar-Rahmaan. Has taught the Qur'an' [TMQ Ar-Rahman: 1-2]. Then he faced them reciting it. He said: They contemplated it then began asking: What is ibn Umm 'Abd saying? He said: Then they said: He is reciting some of what Muhammad came with. So they stood and began striking upon his face and he maintained reciting what Allah willed that he reaches. Then he left to his companions, and he had been affected in the face. They said to him: This is what we feared for you. He said: The enemies of Allah were no more contemptible to me than now, and if you wish I will awake for the like tomorrow. They said: No, it is enough for you, what you said. You have made them hear what they detest." And ibn Kathir reported in 'Jami' Al-Masaneed wa As-Sunan': "From Hatib whom the Messenger of Allah ﷺ had sent to Juraij bin Mina who was the Muqawqis of Alexandria who said to him: Why does your Prophet not invoke against those who expelled him from his land? He said to him: Just as your Prophet did not invoke against those who intended to kill him until Allah raised him to Him. He said to him: You have acted well. You are a wise man coming from a wise man." And Al-Hakim reported in 'Al-Mustadrak' and said (it is) saheeh upon the conditions of the two Sheikhs (Al-Bukhari and Muslim): "From Abu Musa (ra) who said: The Messenger of Allah ﷺ commanded us to depart to the land of An-Najashi. That reached Quraysh and they sent Amru bin Al-As and 'Amara bin Al-Waleed, and they collected gifts for An-Najashi. They came to us and advanced to An-Najashi, arrived to him with gifts, kissed him and prostrated to him. Then Amru bin Al-As said: Verily a folk from us disliked our religion and they are in your land. An-Najashi said to him: In my land? He said: Yes? He said: Send them to me. Ja'far said to us: Let none of you speak. I am your speaker today. So we reached An-Najashi while he was sitting in his assembly, Amru at his right and 'Amara at his left, and the priests and monks seated (samatin). Amru and 'Amara said to him: They do not prostrate to you. When we reached him, the priests and monks with him chided us: Prostrate to your king. Ja'far said: We do not prostrate except to Allah. An-Najashi said to him: And who is that? He said: Verily Allah sent among us His

Messenger, and he is the Messenger that Isa prophesied (to come) after him whose name is Ahmad. He commanded us to worship Allah without associating anything with Him, to establish the prayer, pay the *zakat*, and he commanded us the good and forbade us from the evil. He said: His words amazed the people. When Amru saw that, he said to him: Allah prosper the king. They oppose you in Isa bin Maryam. So An-Najashi said to Ja'far: What does your companion say about the son of Mary? He said: He says about him the saying of Allah: He is the spirit of Allah and His word that He brought forth from the maiden virgin whom no man had approached. He said: Then An-Najashi picked a stick from the ground, then raised it and said: O priests and monks, these do no exceed the width of this, what you say about Isa bin Maryam. Welcome to you and to the one whom you came from. Verily I bear witness that he is the Messenger of Allah, and that he is the one Isa bin Maryam prophesied of. Were it not for what I am on of kingship, I would go to him until I carry his shoes. Dwell in my land as long as you wish, and he commanded food and clothing for them. And he said: Return to these two their gifts." And Ahmad reported this hadith in greater length from Umm Salamat (ra), and it is more detailed than the hadith of Abu Musa (ra). Al-Haithami reported it in 'Al-Majma'a" and said: Its men are the men of the *saheeh (ahadith)* apart from ibn Ishaq, and he explicitly stated that he heard it. Muslims remained struggling with the religions and civilisations of *kufir* after his death in an intellectual and military struggle - as will follow - until Islam spread across the regions of the ancient world save a little thereof. People entered into Islam in crowds, and they shed their previous religions and civilisations and became a single new Ummah, its '*aqeedah* one, its thoughts one, its viewpoint in life one, its system one, its interest one, and its highest ideal one namely raising high the word of Allah. It assumed the position of the leading state in the world, and its towns became the centres of radiance for the enlightened thought, the '*aqeedah* of *tawheed* and the just *Shari'ah*. They carried the Book and *Sunnah*, and the Arabic language, to the world so Islam became the ideology of all, and the interest in the Arabic language became great, until there emerged among them mujtahidoon and scholars of language, without difference between Arab and non-Arab, until they became brothers by the favour of Allah. Today, we see a vicious campaign against the Arabic language to detach it from Islam through wicked styles such as the call to colloquialism, writing the other languages of Muslims in the Latin alphabet, and considering local

colloquial languages as Arabic. It is known that it is impossible for the one who does not know Arabic to understand Islam, not to mention performing *ijtihad* with it. They want the Arabic to become like Latin and Syriac such that none understands Islam except experts in this unused language. In reality, they want it to become a dead language. How would the one who does not understand Arabic be able to understand the news (*khabar*), composition (*insha'a*), command ('*amr*), prohibition (*nahy*), the literal (*haqeeqa*) and metaphoric (*majaz*), the reason ('*illah*), cause (*sabab*), condition (*sharT*), preventive (*maan'i*), general (*a'amm*), specific (*khaas*), absolute (*mutlaq*), restricted (*muqayyad*), the indications of the explicit wording (*mantooq*) and the understood (*mfloom*) and necessity (*iltizam*), the meanings of the letters, conjugation, grammar etc? All of these are necessary to understand the *Shari'ah* texts. Whoever calls to this is an enemy of Islam, and whoever among the Muslims is fooled by these falsehoods is stupid.

However, the embracing of the *deen* of Allah was not general in a complete perfected way, even among the Arabs themselves. The defeated religions and civilisations remained present. They were weak at the beginning due to the disappearance of the environment that allowed their growth. Thus the movement of heretics (*zanadiqa*) failed and was suppressed. However, the negligence of the Arabic language afterwards led to the closure of the gates of *ijtihad* and confusion in understanding the rules, which weakened the State until it became petty states. Some thoughts of the ancient civilisations intruded to Muslims like the idea of asceticism and punishing the body from Hindu philosophy, tribalism among some, the ideas of hidden secret meanings (*batiniyya*) in others, and the inclination to separate from the centre of the Khilafah, weakened the State and stopped the conquests. Rather the Crusaders and Tatars coveted it until the Ottomans came and unified most of the regions of the State under their authority and resumed the conquests. However, the military character dominated it without carrying the ideology in the correct manner, so the peoples of the conquered lands were not melted into the crucible of Islam as occurred in the first conquests. It is possible to perceive the difference between the Uzbek, Tajik, Pushtun, Turkish, Berber, Indian, (*Ad-Deelam*), Turkmen and Kurdish peoples, their love for Islam and adherence to it, and the peoples conquered in the period of the Ottomans like the Serbs, Greeks, Hungarians, Croats, Romanians and others. These quickly conspired

with the West against Islam and their State, and they never abstained whenever offered an opportunity for vengeance. Then the cultural and missionary invasions against Islam started until the Western civilisation achieved the destruction of the Islamic State, fragmented it, and divided the community (*jama'ah*) of Muslims. Nor did Western Capitalism stop at that limit; rather it worked to spread its concepts of nationalism, patriotism, democracy, freedom, man-made canons, and imaginary borders among Muslims. It appointed over these petty states corrupt rulers allied to them who consolidate its influence and concepts, protect its interests, preserve the division, deviate from the way of Allah and oppose every sincere person who attempts to free himself from their noose. They were assisted upon that by agent intellectuals who invite to Western thoughts with passion, defend them, and struggle against the Islamic civilisation, standing with blind sincerity to the side of the Ummah's enemy. The Crusader enemies and their agents among the influential people in the Muslim countries, put under their control the media means and education, thus they became misguided and misguiding. This intellectual assault did not stop so the call to the concepts of Western civilisation of what they call freedoms, democracy, pluralism, civil society, the state of institutions, human rights, women's rights, the patriotic bond, religious dialogue etc, is in full swing. Thus it is truly considered a violent intellectual struggle between the two civilisations; Islamic and Capitalist. This clash is so clear such that it requires no evidence, for we are living it daily, no matter how much some intellectuals and the influential Capitalists attempt to hide it, through distortion and deception. For example, we find the former American president Nixon say in 'The Favourable Opportunity (*al-fursa as-saniha*)': "Our isolation contradicts our values and religious beliefs, which call to spread virtue throughout the world." He also says in his book 'Victory without War': "The revolutionary Islamic ideology is a reaction against modernisation. Communism promises to rotate the hour of history forwards and Islamic fundamentalism returns it backwards...Communist and Islamic revolutionaries are ideological enemies adopting a common aim: Desire to achieve power by any necessary means with the aim of imposing a dominant dictatorship based upon their ideals which are unbearable." We find Berlusconi, the current Italian prime minister, say: "We must be aware of the superiority of our civilisation. The East will remain oriented towards the civilisation of the West and this orientation will increase. This occurred once in the communist world and, also

occurred in parts of the Islamic world." Teri Larson, the coordinator of the Oslo process, welcomed the inclination of Muslims of Palestine towards normalization with the West. One member of the Jewish delegation in Oslo and Wye River, Ori Speer, mentioned in his book 'The Course (Al-Maseera)': "The scarves started to disappear from the heads of women, and the dresses started to be shortened from the lower part, a matter that Larson welcomed, considering it inclined towards normalization with the West." In fact women would not dare to do that during the first Intifada before Oslo. We find also Phyllis Oakley, former Under-Secretary of State say: "We agree with those who say that the clash of civilisations cannot be avoided." Madeleine Albright, former US foreign secretary, said: "We were attacked because of our identity. We adhere to globalisation and defend democracy, freedom and open society. This is the essence of America from which we cannot retreat" (Al-Quds magazine quoting from the translated words of Nathan Charles-Washington). Paul Kennedy, History professor at the American Yale University says: "It is difficult to avoid deducing that the danger of terrorist attacks will not cease. We have not as well realized great success in preventing the occurrence of these attacks. The genie got out of the bottle's neck and it carries the spirit of vengeance; and the car bomb has now become the airplane bomb" (Al-Quds magazine in translated words of 22.9/2001). The former Jewish president, Herzog, said before the Polish parliament in 1992: "The epidemic of Islamic fundamentalism spreads quickly. Nor does it pose a danger to the Jewish people only; rather upon all of humanity" (Al-'Arabi magazine number 514). Shimon Peres said: "Fundamentalism has become the greatest danger of the age after the collapse of communism" (Al-'Arabi magazine number 514). Cyrus Vance, former American foreign secretary, said: "We must be careful and resolved in dealing with these fanatics whose actions are impossible to predict" (Al-'Arabi magazine number 514). The French cultural encyclopaedia states that Muhammad ﷺ is: "Anti-Christ, kidnapper of women, and the greatest enemy to the human intellect."

These and their like explicitly state their enmity to Islam, and their statements are a clear indication that they practice with their Capitalist civilisation violent intellectual struggle against the Islamic civilisation. However, there is another group that attempts to blow ashes in the eyes and delude Muslims, in order to perpetuate their anaesthetisation and make them desist from generating change, while they are not less hostile to Islam and its people. So we find the former American president

Clinton say: "Our enemy in the Middle East is extremism, and he rejected the idea of the clash of civilisations. Similarly he said that the current struggle has no relationship with Islam; it is however a struggle against extremist forces that hide with religion and nationalism. He added saying: that it contradicts with Islamic teachings and emphasised that Islam is a powerful force for tolerance and moderation in the world" (Al-'Arabi magazine number 514). Louis Mitchell, Belgian foreign secretary, says in comment upon the above-mentioned statements of Berlusconi: "When a prime minister of a member state of the European Union speaks with this logic, this is completely rejected. The view that any civilisation is better or of more advanced position than other civilisations is considered as contradicting European values in which we all believe" (above mentioned study circle of Al-Jazeera). Even Bush Jr. who declared openly the 'Crusade' and announced it, this did not prevent him from visiting the Islamic Centre in Washington and describing Islam as a *deen* of peace. Similar to him is his partner in this campaign, the British Prime Minister Blair, who described Islam as being a *deen* of peace, and he used as evidence the meaning of the noble *ayah*:

مَنْ قَتَلَ نَفْسًا بِغَيْرِ نَفْسٍ أَوْ فَسَادَ فِي الْأَرْضِ فَكَانَمَا قَتَلَ النَّاسَ جَمِيعًا
{5:32}

"Whoever kills a soul for other than a soul or (to spread) mischief in the earth, it is as if he killed all of mankind" [TMQ Al-Mai'dah: 32]. It is imperative that Muslims are not beguiled by deceptive words said by the like of these, for their deeds reveal their deep rooted feelings, not their false words, which do not fool a Muslim.

These people know Islam in its reality, rather even better than some Muslims. Nixon, the former American president, whose sayings we have already mentioned his sayings: "Their ideals which cannot be afforded...Fundamentalism turns it backwards...Islamists are ideological enemies", we find him say in his book 'The Favourable Opportunity': "Islam is not merely a religion; rather it is a basis for a great civilisation." So he distinguishes between Islam from Christianity, and he says in the same book in his discussion about fundamentalists: "They are determined to return the previous Islamic civilisation through reviving the past, and they aim to implement the Islamic Shari'ah and announce that Islam is a *deen* and a State." Furthermore he says: "However, our

civilisation is not more advanced than their civilisation. The Islamic world fought communism with more strength than the Western world fought it, and their rejection of material things and the widespread immoral excesses in the Western world is a credit for them and not against them." Just as you see that he is sincere in such words; they, however, did not prevent him from announcing that we are ideological enemies. They also did not prevent him from conspiring against Muslims and assisting Jews against them. So he says in his book 'Victory without War': "Our commitment to the survival of Israel is a profound commitment. We are not official allies. Rather what binds us together is something greater than any paper scraps. It is a moral commitment, a commitment that no president in the past ever abandoned; and every future president will fulfil it with sincerity. America will never permit Israel's enemies who swore to inflict grievous damage upon her to realise their goal in destroying her." He also says in his book 'The Favourable Opportunity': "In order to protect the threatened democratic governments such as Israel and South Korea, we are prepared to use military power if necessary." He also says: "No American president or Congress will ever be able to permit the destruction of Israel." These people understand the reality of Islam and its civilisation; however they insist upon their *kufr*, enmity and tricks. This is not strange. The Muslim might understand the Western civilisation more than some of its sons, yet still he remains sincere to his *deen* and civilisation, just as the contrary can occur. So it is imperative that Muslims are not fooled by these types of statements.

The existence of the rightly guided Khilafah upon the way of Prophethood is the fundamental cornerstone in the clash between Islam and *kufr*. It is naivety and poor understanding to confine the struggle with its various forms to mere da'wah in the various types of media, writing books and individual contacts, at the time wherein Islam is not implemented and the situation of Muslims is deplorable in weakness, disgrace, backwardness and division. Once the State existed, then justice, dignity, happiness, humanity and every type of goodness will be manifested in it; and the near and distant, Muslim and kafir will notice that. Its existence will replace the millions of books and contacts, and thousands of types of media. If what was mentioned before is added to its existence, you will see people entering the *deen* of Allah in crowds.

Forms of the Clash of Civilisations

Intellectual Struggle (as-sira'a ul-fikri)

The intellectual struggle between Islam and the remaining *kufr* civilisations is a factual reality; and it is obligatory upon Muslims, even when the *kuffar* did not initiate the struggle against them. The Messenger of Allah ﷺ initiated it in Makkah before the State and after the secret stage. The situation remained thus until our time and it will remain until when Allah wills. It is quite apparent even if it is obscured to some people. Whoever studied the books of 'Creeds and Sects' (*Al-Millat wan-Nihal*) will find intellectual struggle therein with all the thoughts that Muslims knew.

This struggle between the Western civilisation and Islamic civilisation is manifested in many styles including:

1. Dominance over the media apparatus and directing them for the benefit of the Capitalist civilisation.
2. Dominance over the education syllabi at all its levels in order to spread the Western concepts, distort and fight some of the concepts of Islamic civilisation and forge the history of Muslims.
3. Establishing schools and universities directly supervised by Westerners.
4. Setting up parties that adopt Western civilisation and call for it, and which are protected by the West and its moderate progressive friends.
5. Sponsoring those whom they call the elite, educated and intellectuals, focusing light upon them and promoting them, so that they become the leaders of thought in the countries of the Islamic world.
6. Funding the educational scholarships and courses in their various types, to choose those suitable to become their intellectual or political agents, or agents i.e. spies.
7. Founding institutions, clubs and centres specialised in spreading their poison, and spending generously upon them.

8. Fighting the Arabic language and reviving non-Arabic languages, and inciting nationalistic and patriotic agitations.

Even what is called struggle for interests (*sira'a ul-masalih*) is originally founded upon intellectual differences, and then it is followed by intellectual struggle. This struggle over interests could reach military conflict. The weak one who is not able to engage in military conflict does not embark on a struggle for interests, except as much as the hyena or fox can do to the lion's prey. This struggle for interests could be between two different civilisations, just as it is possible to be between two countries or peoples of one civilisation. When America invaded the Gulf, occupied it and extended its influence upon it, settled, established (itself) and gained ground, its goal definitely was not the liberation of Kuwait; rather it was a struggle over the petrol interests and spreading the influence. As one of them said: "We came to correct the mistake of the Lord" i.e. in His subhanahu wa ta'ala creating petrol in the Gulf instead of the West. And Schultz said in a television programme on 16/12/90: "It is necessary to demolish Iraq militarily, even if it withdrew from Kuwait." And Dick Cheney said before Congress on 3/12/90: "It is necessary to guarantee that this type of invasion is not repeated irrespective of the manner of settling this, and even if Saddam withdrew from Kuwait." It is known that Iraq, Kuwait and the rest of the Gulf were until that time a region of British influence, so America was struggling with Britain politically and economically, even though both of them belong to one civilisation namely Capitalism. At the same time, it was struggling with Muslims politically, economically and militarily, and it adopts Capitalism and struggles with Muslims who abandoned their Islamic civilisation or most of its concepts. America's struggle with Muslims in the previous styles is built upon a civilisational concept for them, namely colonizing weaker nations and allowing the domination of their capabilities. Look at it is now repeating the attack in Central Asia. Likewise its struggle with Britain is built upon a civilisation concept different to that upon which its struggle with Arabs is built. It struggles with Britain in the Gulf because it must be alone in its leadership of the New World, and in plundering the resources of the weak. America, as Bush says, must be the vanguard so there is no scope for two poles in the world leadership; rather it is only one leader, which must be America, the heir of ancient colonialism, without rival. Among examples of the struggle between two civilisations is the struggle that was between the

Capitalist America and the communist Soviet Union. It however, did not reach the point of military conflict, and was restricted to the political, intellectual and economic struggle that ended with the collapse of the Soviet Union. Of the examples of struggle between the sons of one civilisation is the struggle between the Nazis and others among the Capitalists; it was a struggle between those who view the superiority of the German race over other races and those who deny racial distinction between the races of the European and American peoples that adopt Capitalism. However, the struggle remained within the domain of one civilisation. It was based upon a specific concept which was a part of the Nazis' civilisation opposite to the concept of the Allies.

The intellectual struggle is the basis for every struggle on the face of the earth from the difference of the two sons of Adam until our time; and it will continue until when Allah wills. Accordingly, we began with the intellectual struggle.

Economic Struggle

Economic struggle existed from ancient times, however, today it has become organized, comprehensive destructive and dreadful, such that the followers of the powerful civilisation started to devour the slaves of Allah, among the followers of other civilisations, without mercy, sympathy or humanity. The world has thus become a large jungle where the strong devour the weak. It is true that the world is a small village in relation to communication and transport; however it is a jungle in relation to the supremacy of the strong over the weak. This is evident in what the Capitalism practices - particularly its leader America - of styles including:

First: Domination over raw materials whenever a way to achieve that is found.

Second: Making the dollar an alternative to gold as the world's currency. Europe tries to struggle against its hegemony by its currency called the 'Euro', and some states try to return to the gold and silver standard. However, America fights any attempt to return to the gold standard.

Third: Continuing to make the developing countries mere markets for consumption by preventing them from [developing] heavy industry and even many of the light industries.

Fourth: Drowning the developing countries with compound interest loans through the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank. The danger of these loans is obvious.

Fifth: Attracting the emigrant professionals and intellectuals who do not find any place for themselves in their original countries, and so are forced to emigrate to the West.

Sixth: Formulating policies predominantly imposed by the IMF leading to the absence of food security in these countries, such that they fall under the mercy of aid, grants and loans after they have been self-sufficient.

Seventh: Igniting regional wars to push states to purchase weapons, which quickly transform into mere outdated, insignificant, rusting scrap metal, unless they are used in their regional wars.

Eighth: Working for the absence of security in various countries, such that [their] capital migrates to more secure countries like Europe and America, which they then freeze under various pretexts whenever they wish. If we know that the Arab countries alone have capital in the West amounting to 800 billion dollars at the lowest estimate, we are able to imagine even approximately what has been plundered from the Islamic lands, all of them under-developed countries, without mentioning other developing countries.

Ninth: Dominating economic interests in various countries through what they call globalisation, privatisation and capital investments owned by giant Capitalist corporations.

Tenth: Designating rulers who are their agents together with armies and intelligence services whose function is to protect their interests.

Eleventh: Landing forces in some sensitive global regions and settling therein, to perpetuate the extension of influence, as America did in the

Gulf, Sinai, Central Asia, Turkey and elsewhere. This is in addition to the fleets that cruise the oceans to secure the plunder of riches.

Twelfth: Working to fragment the world into many countries in the name of independence to perpetuate their weakness and facilitate dominance over them.

Thirteenth: Spreading their culture and civilisational concepts to perpetuate dominance over defeated countries and to distance them from thinking about change and liberation from their claws.

Fourteenth: Imposing sanctions upon some countries, like the sanctions America imposed upon Iraq. It issued resolutions through the Security Council under Number 665 to boycott Iraq and grant the American navies the right to use force to prevent trade with Iraq. Bob Woodward commented in his book 'Leaders' upon this resolution saying: "This was the first time in United Nations history spanning forty five years that it granted countries outside its umbrella the right to impose economic sanctions. This was a magnificent diplomatic victory for the American administration."

Political struggle

As for political struggle between the Western civilisation and Muslims, it was evident in the following:

First: Their destruction of the Khilafah in 1924.

Second: Their establishing of the Jewish state in Palestine, and preserving it and its characteristic military supremacy.

Third: They're dividing of the Muslims' community (*jama'ah*) and encouraging this division under the name of independence, until they became about sixty entities and they still work for fragmentation and division. The danger of destructive fragmentation is not hidden from the intelligent. Muslims are strongly inclined to this idea of independence and fighting for its sake even though it completely clashes with their civilisation and concepts. Allah commanded them to be one body (*jami'an*) and not divided, but they proceed with division and consecrating

division even though they recite day and night His ﷺ saying:

وَاعْتَصِمُوا بِحَبْلِ اللَّهِ جَمِيعًا وَلَا تَنْفَرُوا ۚ آل عمران 103

"Hold fast, all together, to the rope of Allah and do not divide" [TMQ Al-Imran: 103]. All together (*jami'an*) is the condition of those holding fast to the rope of Allah; its meaning is the community (*jama'ah*); rather it is the community itself due to his ﷺ saying:

مَنْ أَتَكُمْ وَأَمْرَكُمْ جَمِيعُ عَلَىٰ رَجُلٍ وَاحِدٍ يَرِيدُ أَنْ يُشْقِعَ عَصَمَكُمْ أَوْ يُفْرِقَ جَمَاعَتَكُمْ فَاقْتُلُوهُ.

"Whoever comes to you and your affair is united under one man aiming to break your power or divide your community (*jama'ah*), kill him!" So all together (*jamian*) and community (*jama'ah*) under one man, have the same meaning.

Fourth: Implementing their political systems, republican and monarchical, formally in the Islamic regions, together with separating the authorities formally into three authorities as is the situation with them.

Fifth: They are fighting the serious movements that are working for change through establishing the Islamic State, the rightly guided Khilafah State. At times they call them extremists and at other times they call them fundamentalists. This fight is mostly through the use of their agents and rarely directly. "Martin Indyck, the official responsible for Middle Eastern affairs stood in the White House to say that the challenge facing America in the East is assisting friendly countries to contain extremism" (Al-'Arabi magazine number 514). If they were unable to contain it, they suppressed it with harshness and malice through their 'progressive moderate friends', those about whom Nixon said in 'The Favourable Opportunity': "The relationship of many politicians in the Islamic countries with Islam does not exceed their relationship with its ideals, customs and norms...Progressives: This is a group whose activity is noticeable... and it strives to tie the Muslims with the civilized world in the political and economic spheres. This group is distinguished with flexibility, and they do not describe the West as being atheist. Rather they call them the People of the Book. Some of the countries ruled by the progressives are democratic like Turkey and Pakistan...We must

assist the progressives in the Muslim world...The key of the American policy is represented in the strategic cooperation with the progressive Muslims only. Since we associate with progressives in our goals, our cooperation must cover all economic and security areas...It is imperative that the relationship between America and partner states does not reach the level of guardianship, and we must not treat the leaders in the progressive states as if they are our correspondents between us and their peoples, rather we must treat them as equal partners, because the quickest way to bury them is treating them as mouthpieces for Western propaganda...We must accept at time the rejection of our friends in the Islamic world of some of our actions that cause them political difficulties in their countries." The *Ummah* knows well these 'progressive moderate friends', and there is nothing wrong in reminding her of what the rulers of Iraq, Egypt, Turkey, Uzbekistan, Algeria, Syria, Libya and Tunisia did to the sincere among the sons of this *Ummah*.

Sixth: Founding the United Nations and Security Council to grant legitimacy to intervene in the affairs of weak countries, among them the states existing in the Islamic world. If America could not intervene through the Security Council due to the wrangling of some super powers, it bypasses the Security Council and United Nations and acts independently in a solitary manner; such as the case now, in what it called the 'Crusade War against Terrorism' so it goes out wherever it likes and strikes whoever it likes. Nixon stated explicitly in his book 'The Favourable Opportunity' about this policy saying: "When the interests of the United States are exposed to harm, it will act in coordination with the UN whenever possible. However, if the matter was not possible, it will act alone without assistance from it." Collard Power, political science professor at Massachusetts University, said in his article: "It is clear that international law does not apply to the Western hemisphere...It seems that breach of human rights is accepted as long as it serves American interests."

Seventh: Assembling a number of profiteers and tyrants whom they call parties, where they hand over the power to one of them and classify the remainder as opposition. This is if they did not impose what they call the single party system.

These are some of the forms of the political struggle that the followers

of the Capitalist civilisation wage upon Muslims and others. They succeeded in all these forms, due to the absence of the good guardian and good system, represented by the Khilafah State.

Military Conflict

Then we move onto the last type of conflict between civilisations; that is the military conflict, which among Muslims is called jihad and it is a wide subject. What concerns us here is proving the inevitability of military conflict particularly in the Islamic civilisation; the attempt by some to negate the obligation of offensive fighting (*qital ut-talab*), then rebutting those who say that Islam is the *deen* of tolerance and peace; then is Islam a *deen* of terror?

We begin with the actions of the followers of the kafir civilisations with Muslims; they are more eloquent in indication than words because they are tangible and sensed. Australia, whom we never fought once, occupied East Timor. China occupies an entire region (*wilayah*) of southern Central Asia; Russia occupies several Islamic regions like the Caucasus region, Crimea, Khazan etc. India occupies Delhi, Kashmir and the whole of northern India. The Americans dominate the entire Gulf and extend their political and military influence across Central Asia, from Uzbekistan to the Gulf and go into the Sina, beside they have a large military base in Incirlik in Turkey. Moreover, they struggle with both France and Britain over their influence in Africa. The British have a remnant of influence in both Asia and Africa, and a military presence in the Gulf and Gibraltar. The Serbs, Croats, Greeks, Romanians and Bulgarians occupy Islamic lands. Spain occupies Andalusia, Sabta and Maleela. The Italians occupy Sicily, the land of Al-Aghaliba. The islands of the Mediterranean sea are all occupied and they are Islamic lands. The Philippines occupies Islamic lands and Burma does likewise. The Jewish state occupies Palestine which is part of the frontiers of Bilad Ash-Sham. The Messenger of Allah ﷺ said the truth when he said:

يُوشكُ أَنْ تَدْعُوكُمُ الْأَمْمُ كَمَا تَدْعُوكُمُ الْأَكْلَةَ إِلَى قُصْعَتِهَا فَقَالَ قَاتِلُ :

وَمَنْ قَلَّهُ نَحْنُ يَوْمَنْدُ؟ قَالَ بَلْ أَنْتُمْ يَوْمَنْدُ كَثِيرٌ وَلَكُنْكُمْ غَثَاءُ السَّيْلِ

وليت عن الله من صدور عدوكم المهابة منكم وليقذن الله في قلوبكم
الوهن فقال قائل يا رسول الله وما الوهن قال حب الدنيا وكراهية الموت

"The nations are on the verge of summoning each other over you, as the eaters summon each other over their large bowl. So a speaker said: Is it due to our small number on that day? He said: No, rather that day you will be many, but you will be foam like the foam of the torrent. Allah will remove from the chests of your enemies the fear from you and Allah will cast 'al-wahan' in your hearts. A speaker said: O Messenger of Allah, what is 'al-wahan'? He said: Loving the world and the fear of death" (narrated by Abu Dawud from Thawban).

Despite this painful reality that suffices to prove the struggles of the followers of *kafir* civilisations with Muslims, it does not however hinder corroborating this idea with the sayings of some of their politicians and thinkers i.e. from the followers of the civilisations of *kufr*.

--Nixon says in his book 'Victor without War': "Real glory does not come from avoiding conflict, but rather from our being in its tumult fighting for our principles, interests and friends...We must discard our delusions about how the world runs. Americans incline to believe that conflict is unnatural, that the peoples of every nation are fundamentally similar, while differences are due to misunderstanding, and that permanent and comprehensive peace is an attainable goal. History however refutes these views, because each nation differs from another in fundamental aspects, the political conventions, historical experience and ideological motivation. These are aspects that normally give birth to conflicts. Conflicting interests and the fact that we understand each other lead to disputes and eventually wars...However, comprehensive peace i.e. the existence of a world without conflicts is mere delusion. The like of this peace has not existed and nor will it ever exist." Nixon also says in 'The Favourable Opportunity': "The interest is vital when its loss threatens the security of the United States. Thus the continuous independence of western Europe, Japan, Canada, Mexico and the Gulf states is a vital issue for our country's security. Likewise, we have a vital interest in that the under-developed countries do not obtain nuclear weapons. The US has no choice except using the armed forces to prevent

the threat to its interests...In order to protect the threatened democratic governments, like in Israel and South Korea, we are prepared to use military force if necessary."

--On 23/1/1980 Carter delivered a 'State of the Union' address to the American Congress, and of what he said: "However, our position is completely clear. Any attempt from any external power to dominate the Gulf region will be considered an attack on the vital interests of the United States. Such aggression will be repelled by the use of any necessary means including military."

--On 2/11/1990 Henry Kissinger published an article in *Yediot Ahrunot* under the heading 'Soon, America, You will Lose Deterrent Force', and of what he said therein: "The military option is without doubt painful and difficult. It can incite demonstrations in Islamic countries and release the spark of new waves of terrorism. However, these dangers must be compared against the dangers of a more difficult conflict at a later time if the signs of American weakness lead to the collapse of moderate governments in the region, escalating the tension and the end of all systems."

--On 18/9/2001, it was published in the (Amerikatan) newspaper, on the internet an interview with the French newspaper *Le Figaro* conducted with James Schlesinger, Nixon's advisor and former American Defense Secretary who currently works in the Centre for Strategic and International Studies, and of what he said: "Uprooting these networks requires many years because they enjoy a strong determination resulting from their strong belief in their position."

--On the programme 'First War of the Century' on Al-Jazeera the presenter of the programme quoted from the Washington Post that Henry Kissinger said under the title 'Revenge is not Sufficient Response': "It is necessary to face what happened with an attack against the system that produced this threat."

--The former Secretary (General) of the NATO alliance, Claus, formally announced that the alliance endorsed Islam in the place of the former Soviet Union, as a target for its enmity. BBCOnline.net quoted from President Bush on 17/9/2001 his saying: "This crusade, this war

upon terror will be for a long period."

--Samuel Huntingdon says in his article in the American magazine 'Foreign Affairs': "There is little possibility this continuous military confrontation between the West and Islam since many centuries will weaken. Rather it is possible that it will increase in viciousness and severity..."

--Shimon Peres said in his book 'The New Middle East': "...We are a determined people and there is no power on the face of the earth able to induce us to abandon this land after fifty generations of living in the Diaspora, fifty generations of suppression, torment and annihilation. We will never move from the only place in this world, in which we are able to renew our independence, guarantee our safety and live with dignity and honour..."

--Steve Dunleavy said in the New York Post journal after the incident of Tuesday: "Kill the bastards, train assassins, make contract with mercenaries and earmark millions of dollars to hunt the heads and bring them dead or alive, preferably dead. In relation to the cities who host these worms, bomb them with bombs in basketball playgrounds."

The Probable Evidences of those who deny Civilisation Struggle in Islam

These are their actions and sayings and they are both in harmony, yet the deluded, and some naïve Muslims, insist upon dialogue and deny the clash and struggle between civilisations. Some of this Ummah persist upon dialogue between religions, specifying Christianity with this dialogue, thus look for points of reunion between Islam and Christianity such as fighting against atheism, forgetting or pretending to forget that *kufr* is one creed:

لَكُمْ دِينُكُمْ وَلِيَ دِينٌ {109:6}

"To you is your deen" [TMQ Al-Kafirun: 6] for Allah subhanahu addressed the disbelievers with the language of plurality and said:

فُلْ يَا أَيُّهَا الْكَافِرُونَ الْكَافِرُونَ 1

"Say: O you disbelievers." [TMQ Al-Kafirun: 1] Then He mentioned the *deen* in singular form and said:

لَكُمْ دِينُكُمْ وَلِيَ دِينٌ {109:6}

"To you is your deen" [TMQ Al-Kafirun: 6]. Or like meetings to solve the Palestinian problem. Yet who created the Jewish state, protected it and assisted it with money, weapons and support, other than the kafir states founded upon the Capitalist civilisation?! The deluded have a duty to discharge, because they are intellectual agents. As for the naïve, they are joking and occupy themselves with something futile, and they share in deluding the masses. They enter into meetings, dialogues and sessions invited by Jews and Christians. They are dubious calls, whose callers intend to detach us from our *deen*, and mix the truth with falsehood, without sparing any effort for that: "Never will the Jews and Christians be pleased with you until you follow their creed. Say:

إِنَّ هُدَى اللَّهِ هُوَ الْهُدَىٰ وَلَنِ اتَّبَعْتَ أَهْوَاءَهُمْ بَعْدَ الَّذِي جَاءَكَ مِنَ الْعِلْمِ
مَا لَكَ مِنَ اللَّهِ مِنْ وَلِيٌّ وَلَا نَصِيرٌ الْبَقْرَةُ 120

'Verily the guidance of Allah is the (only) guidance.' And if you were to follow their desires after what came to you of knowledge, then you would have against Allah no protector or helper" [TMQ Al-Baqarah: 120].

(And):

وَدُوا لَوْ تُنْهِنُ فَيُنْهَنُوْنَ {68: 9}

"They wish that you compromise (with them) so that they compromise (with you)" [TMQ Al-Qalam: 9] i.e. incline to them. This ayah, even though it was revealed about the Makkah polytheists, however it applies upon every disbeliever (*kafir*) and polytheist (*mushrik*). The definite *aayaat* prove, and the *Sahabah* have had a consensus (*ijmaa*), and the Islamic *Ummah* knows, that the People of the Book are disbelievers; hence it is not possible to compromise with them and or incline towards them. Rather, it is obligatory to demonstrate the fallacy of their *deen*, their disbelief and lies, and invite them to enter the true *deen*, the *deen* of Islam. After establishing the Khilafah State, they are invited to Islam; if they reject,

then the Jizyah, and if they reject, then the sword. It is deception to deduce with His ﷺ saying:

وَلَا تُجَادِلُوا أَهْلَ الْكِتَابَ إِلَّا بِالْتِي هِيَ أَحْسَنُ
29:46

"Argue not with the People of the Book except with that which is better" [TMQ Al-Ankabut: 46] and remain silent about the ayah's conclusion: "except those who do wrong among them. And say:

آمَنَّا بِالَّذِي أُنْزِلَ إِلَيْنَا وَأُنْزِلَ إِلَيْكُمْ وَإِلَهُنَا وَإِلَهُكُمْ وَاحِدٌ وَكُنْ لَهُ
مُسْلِمُونَ العَكْبُوت 46

"We believe in that which was revealed to us and revealed to you, our God and your God is one, and we submit (in Islam) to Him" [TMQ Al-Ankabut: 46]. So those who among them made wrong are excluded from the arguing with that which is better; they are the one who fight and do not pay the jizyah, so what is required is the triumph over them and not arguing with them.

It is also erroneous to deduce His ﷺ saying:

وَقُلْ لِلَّذِينَ لَا يُؤْمِنُونَ اعْمَلُوا عَلَى مَكَانِتُكُمْ إِنَّا عَامِلُونَ وَانتَظِرُوا إِنَّا
مُنَظَّرُونَ {11:121-122}

"And say to those who do not believe: 'Act according to your ability, situation and way. We are acting (likewise). And wait! We (too) are waiting" [TMQ Hud: 121-2] as 'peaceful co-existence between us and them'. This command indicates intimidation and threat. Rather, we are commanded, beyond intimidating and threatening them, to fight them until they embrace Islam or pay the jizyah as will follow. So where is the peaceful co-existence?! As for the deduction with His ﷺ saying:

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَالَّذِينَ هَادُوا وَالصَّابِئِينَ وَالنَّصَارَى وَالْمَجُوسَ وَالَّذِينَ
أَشْرَكُوا إِنَّ اللَّهَ يَفْصِلُ بَيْنَهُمْ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ إِنَّ اللَّهَ عَلَى كُلِّ شَيْءٍ شَهِيدٌ
{22:17}

"Verily those who believe and the Jews and Sabians and Christians and Zoroastrians, and those who associate (with Allah), verily Allah will judge between them on the Day of Resurrection. Verily Allah is witness over all things" [TMQ Al-Hajj: 17] for leaving "the differences in beliefs and conduct between us and them to Allah to judge between us on the Day of Resurrection." If this means not compelling them to enter Islam, then it is correct. If it means that Allah will judge between them on the Day of Resurrection, then that is also correct. If it means not inviting them to the *deen* of truth, it is false, because we are commanded to carry the *da'wah* to them until they embrace Islam or pay *jizyah* or they are fought. If it means not fighting them, this is also wrong, because the offensive war (*qital ut-talab*) is fard as will follow.

As for deducing from His ﷺ saying:

لَا يَنْهَاكُمُ اللَّهُ عَنِ الدِّينِ لَمْ يُقَاتِلُوكُمْ فِي الدِّينِ وَلَمْ يُخْرِجُوكُمْ مِنْ
دِيَارِكُمْ أَنْ تَبْرُوْهُمْ وَتَقْسِطُوا إِلَيْهِمْ إِنَّ اللَّهَ يُحِبُّ الْمُقْسِطِينَ
{60:8}

"Allah does not prohibit you to deal kindly and justly with regard to those who did not fight you over the *deen* nor drove you from your houses. Verily Allah loves those are just" [TMQ Al-Mumtahinah: 8] upon kindness, justice and treating these people well. It is said that what is meant by this ayah is those who believed in Makkah and did not emigrate, so the deduction with it is outside the subject. If the meaning is every one of the people of (other) religions, the deduction is correct regarding those who did not fight us or drive us out from our houses. Definitely this does not include those who fight the Muslims of Palestine, expelling them and assisting in their expulsion. Also it does not include everyone who fights the Afghans now, expelling them and assisting in their expulsion. Likewise, it does not include any people fighting us in Iraq since the Second Gulf War, neither does it include those fighting us in Kashmir, Chechnya and their like.

If they use as evidence His ﷺ saying:

وَإِنْ جَنَحُوا لِلسلْمِ فَاجْنِحْ لَهَا {8:61}

"And if they incline to peace, then you incline to it" [TMQ Al-Anfal: 61] (to

say) that Islam is a *deen* of peace and that peace is the origin, then this *ayah* has to be understood together with this *ayah*.

فَلَا تَهِنُوا وَتَدْعُوا إِلَى السَّلْمِ وَأَنْتُمُ الْأَعْلَوْنَ {47: 35}

"Be not weak and call to peace while you have the upper hand" [TMQ Muhammad: 35].

So if Muslims are living with dignity, strength, power and (as one) group (*jama'ah*), then no peace. The evaluation of the benefit, or otherwise, of peace is left to the *Khaleefah*, and there is no importance to the evaluation of anyone else unless he is delegated by him. If they use as evidence His ﷺ saying:

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا ادْخُلُوا فِي السَّلْمِ كَافَةً وَلَا تَتَبَعُوا خُطُواتِ الشَّيْطَانِ
إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَكُمْ عَدُوٌّ مُّبِينٌ الْبَقْرَةُ 208

"O you who believe, enter into submission (as-silm) completely and do not follow the footsteps of Satan. Verily he is an open enemy to you." [TMQ Al-Baqarah: 208] It is said that it is necessary to know those being addressed with this *ayah* then know the meaning of 'as-silm'. 'Those who believe' could mean the Muslims as being addressed, and it could be the believers in Prophets before Muhammad, and 'as-silm' could here be Islam or it could mean peace (*sulh*). If those addressed are the believers in Muhammad ﷺ, there is no meaning in saying to them: 'Enter into peace with believers', because they are not warriors but are rather believers like them; it is only said to them: 'Enter completely into Islam, meaning the obeying of all His *Shari'ah* and establishing His limits and rules, without trying to choose some and leaving some.' If those addressed are the believers in the previous Prophets, there is no meaning in requesting them to enter into peace; rather this meaning does not exist in the Qur'an. At-Tabari said: "As for calling them initially to peace, this does not exist in the Qur'an." So the meaning is calling them to Islam and to enter therein. Thus whoever was the one addressed, there is no call therein for Muslims to enter into treaty of peace with disbelievers i.e. mutual peace (*muwada'ah*). And if they use as evidence His ﷺ saying:

فَإِنْ اعْتَزَلُوكُمْ فَلَمْ يُقَاتِلُوكُمْ وَالَّتَّوْا إِلَيْكُمُ السَّلَمَ فَمَا جَعَلَ اللَّهُ لَكُمْ عَلَيْهِمْ
سَبِيلًا النساء 90

"And if they withdraw from you, fight not against you and offer you peace, then Allah has opened no way for you against them" [TMQ An-Nisa: 90] (to say) that it is *haram* for Muslims to initiate fighting against peaceful disbelievers who withdraw from fighting Muslims. It is said that this *ayah* relates to hypocrites who befriend and reach a people with whom we have a covenant i.e. they follow their rule in the treaty (*muwada'ah*). It might mean those who go out with them under compulsion to fight us and then they withdraw from the fighting, like those who came out on the day of Badr with the polytheists; then there is no way for us against them. If they use as evidence His ﷺ saying:

أَذْنَ لِلَّذِينَ يُقَاتَلُونَ بِأَنَّهُمْ ظَلَمُوا وَإِنَّ اللَّهَ عَلَى نَصْرِهِمْ لَقَدِيرٌ {22:39}

"Permission (to fight) is given to those who were fought, because they were oppressed. And verily Allah is Able to support them" [TMQ Al-Hajj: 39] (to say) that the permission to fight is for the oppressed against whoever initiated fighting against him. It is said that the command to fight is absolute (mutlaq) without restriction to the situation of oppression. This is because His ﷺ saying: "because they were oppressed" is not a divine reason ('illah) for fighting, but rather a descriptive reality (*wasf waqi*). This is because the Quraysh used to severely harm the Muslims who would come to Rasool Allah ﷺ, beaten and wounded in the head, complaining to him and he would say to them: "Be patient for I have not been commanded with fighting" until they emigrated. Then this *ayah* was revealed wherein Allah commanded them with fighting after He prevented them from it. Ad-Dahahk said: "The companions of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ sought permission to fight the disbelievers when they harmed them, and Allah revealed:

إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يُحِبُّ كُلَّ خَوَانِ كَفُورٍ {22:38}

'Verily Allah likes not any treacherous disbeliever" [TMQ Al-Hajj: 38]. When he emigrated, it was revealed:

أَذْنَ لِلَّذِينَ يُقَاتَلُونَ بِأَنَّهُمْ ظُلْمُوا وَإِنَّ اللَّهَ عَلَى نَصْرِهِمْ لَقَدِيرٌ {22:39}

'Permission (to fight) is given to those who were fought because they were oppressed. And verily Allah is Able to support them' [TMQ Al-Hajj: 39]. Thus the *ayah* was revealed to lift the ban from Muslims in repelling harm from them. So it is a specific situation, even if it avails the command to fight via the indicated meaning (*dalalat al-ishara*). So the *ayah* does not explain the legitimacy of fighting in the way of Allah, but the legitimacy of fighting to repel harm. Thus there is no contradiction between this *ayah* and the *aayaat* of At-Taubah. Moreover, the *aayaat* of At-Taubah were revealed later, so there is no abrogation, specification or restriction (to them).

If they deduce with the *hadith* of ibn Abi Awfa that is agreed upon: The Messenger of Allah ﷺ said:

أَيُّهَا النَّاسُ لَا تَتَمَنُوا لِقَاءَ الْعُدُوِّ وَسُلُّوَ اللَّهُ الْعَافِيَةَ إِذَا لَفِتَمُوهُمْ فَاصْبِرُوْا
وَاعْلَمُوْا أَنَّ الْجَنَّةَ تَحْتَ ظَلَالِ السَّيْوِفِ

"**O people, do not wish to meet the enemy and ask Allah for well-being. And if you meet them, be patient and know that Paradise is under the shadow of swords.**" This *hadith* has no relation with mutual peace, since what is therein is prohibition from wishing to meet them not prohibition from fighting them or the command for making peace with them. The scholars have said this prohibition is due to what there is in wishing to meet the enemy of pride (*ijab*); so it is a deduction out of context. There are other attempts of deduction that do not deserve rebuttal, nay they do not (even) deserve mention. However we mention them to prove that some of these people do not refrain from gathering the evidences in any way. Their main concern is to prove Islam is a *deen* of peace and not a *deen* of struggle, conflict and jihad. Rather, in their view it is rather a *deen* of security, peace and tolerance. Some of what they claim to be evidence in the subject is His ﷺ saying:

وَآمِنُهُمْ مِنْ خَوْفٍ {106:4}

"And made them safe from fear" [TMQ Quraish: 4] and His ﷺ saying:

حَرَمًا آمِنًا {29:67}

"...a secure sanctuary" [TMQ Al-Ankabut: 67] and His ﷺ saying:

وَهَذَا الْبَلْدَ الْأَمِينَ {95:3}

"And by this city of security" [TMQ At-Tin: 3] and His ﷺ saying:

وَلَيَدِلَّنَّهُمْ مِنْ بَعْدِ خَوْفِهِمْ {24:55}

"And We will exchange for them security after their fear" [TMQ An-Nur: 55]. And his saying ﷺ:

مَنْ أَصْبَحَ مِنْكُمْ آمِنًا فِي سَرِّهِ

"**Whoever of you awakes safe in his flock (sirb).**" This, indeed, is scorning of the *Shar'a* and the minds of people!

Rebutting the Probable Evidences of those Denying the Offensive Jihad (Jihad ut-talab)

Those saying Islam is a *deen* of peace deny offensive *jihad* i.e. initiating fighting with the disbelievers. They confirm the defensive war and deny the offensive war (*qital ut-talab*) i.e. initiating the attack. Some of them believe there is no necessity for this matter since it is possible to overcome the material obstacles and convey the *da'wah* to disbelievers without colliding with these obstacles, by using the internet, media, books, leaflets, building mosques and Islamic centres in the heart of the countries of disbelievers, and live contacts with individuals to make them enter the *deen* of Allah. They claim that this takes the place of offensive war. This view collides with the texts of the Book, *Sunnah* and *Ijmaa Us-Sahabah* that all command that we initiate fighting against them, even if they do not initiate against us, if they do not accept Islam or pay the *jizyah* and submit to the rule of Islam. These texts are not reasoned with the reason (*illah*) that *Jihad* is only obliged in the situation of inability to convey verbally. As for the Book, it is His ﷺ saying:

قَاتَلُوا الَّذِينَ لَا يُؤْمِنُونَ بِاللَّهِ وَلَا بِالْيَوْمِ الْآخِرِ وَلَا يُحِرِّمُونَ مَا حَرَمَ اللَّهُ

وَرَسُولُهُ وَلَا يَدِينُونَ دِينَ الْحَقِّ مِنَ الَّذِينَ أُوتُوا

الْكِتَابَ حَتَّى يُعْطُوا الْجُزْيَةَ عَنْ يَدِ وَهُمْ صَاغِرُونَ {9:29}

"Fight those who do not believe in Allah nor the Last Day, nor forbid what Allah and His Messenger forbid nor follow the deen of the People of the Book until they pay jizyah readily and they are humbled" [TMQ At-Taubah: 29].

And His ﷺ saying:

وَقَاتِلُوا الْمُشْرِكِينَ كَافَّةً وَاعْلَمُوا أَنَّ اللَّهَ مَعَ الْمُتَّقِينَ
{9:36}

"Fight the polytheists collectively as they fight you collectively. And remember that Allah is with the pious" [TMQ At-Taubah:36].

And His ﷺ saying:

يَا أَيُّهَا النَّبِيُّ جَاهِدِ الْكُفَّارَ وَالْمُنَافِقِينَ وَاغْلُظْ عَلَيْهِمْ وَمَأْوَاهُمْ جَهَنَّمُ وَبِشَّرْ
الْمَصِيرُ {9:73}

"O Prophet, fight the disbelievers and hypocrites and be harsh against them. Their abode is Hellfire, a wretched destination!" [TMQ At-Taubah:73].

And His ﷺ saying:

إِنَّ اللَّهَ اشْتَرَى مِنَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ أَنفُسَهُمْ وَأَمْوَالَهُمْ بِأَنَّ لَهُمُ الْجَنَّةَ يُقَاتِلُونَ فِي
سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ فَيُقْتَلُونَ وَيُقْتَلُونَ وَعَدَ اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ حَقًا فِي التَّوْرَاةِ وَالْإِنْجِيلِ وَالْقُرْآنِ
وَمَنْ أُوفِيَ بِعَهْدِهِ مِنَ اللَّهِ فَاسْتَبْشِرُوا بِيَعْكُمُ الَّذِي بَأْيَعْتُمْ بِهِ وَذَلِكَ هُوَ
الْفَوْزُ الْعَظِيمُ {9:111}

"Verily Allah purchased from the believers their souls and property so that Paradise is for them. They fight in the way of Allah, they kill and are killed. A promise binding upon Him in the Torah, Bible and Qur'an, and who is truer to his covenant than Allah? Then rejoice in the bargain that you have concluded. And that is the supreme success" [TMQ At-Taubah:111].

And His ﷺ saying:

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا قَاتِلُوا الَّذِينَ يُلُوِّنُكُمْ مِنَ الْكُفَّارِ وَلْيَجِدُوا فِيْكُمْ غِلْظَةً
وَاعْلَمُوا أَنَّ اللَّهَ مَعَ الْمُتَّقِينَ {9:123}

"O you who believe, fight those who are close to you among the disbelievers and let them find harshness in you. And know that Allah is with the pious" [TMQ At-

Taubah: 123]. These are *aayaat* from At-Taubah which is among the last which was revealed without anything coming to specify, restrict or abrogate it, so it is evidence that *Jihad* encompasses defensive and offensive war i.e. the fighting of defence and offence. As for His ﷺ saying:

وَإِنْ جَنَحُوا لِلسَّلْمِ فَاجْنِحْ لَهَا {8:61}

"And if they incline to peace, then you incline to it" [TMQ Al-Anfal: 61] and His ﷺ saying:

وَقَاتِلُوا فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ الَّذِينَ يُقَاتِلُونَكُمْ وَلَا تَعْتَدُوا إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يُحِبُّ
الْمُعْتَدِلِينَ {2:190}

"Fight in the way of Allah those fighting you and do not transgress. Verily Allah loves not the transgressors" [TMQ Al-Baqarah: 190] and His ﷺ saying:

أَذْنَ لِلَّذِينَ يُقَاتِلُونَ بِأَنَّهُمْ ظَلِمُوا وَإِنَّ اللَّهَ عَلَى نَصْرِهِمْ لَقَدِيرٌ {22:39}

"Permission (to fight) has been given to those who were fought because they were oppressed. Verily Allah is Able to support them" [TMQ Al-Hajj: 39]. These *aayaat* and their like are not suitable to specify the generality of the *aayaat* of At-Taubah, nor restrict those which are unrestricted (*mutlaq*) because they were all revealed before the *aayaat* of At-Taubah, and the precedent (text) does not specify the later (text) nor restrict it. This is because specification is equivalent to abrogation of a part of the general (text) as it diverts the rule from its generality, by invalidating it in a part of it and putting another rule in its place. As long as specification is equivalent to abrogation, and it is stipulated in abrogation that the abrogator (*nasikh*) is later than the abrogated (*mansukh*), then these *aayaat* are not suitable to specify the *aayaat* of At-Taubah because they are precedent to it in revelation. The *aayaat* of At-Taubah are among the last of what was revealed in *Jihad*, so specification does not arise. What is said regarding specification is likewise said regarding restriction, as it is necessary for the restricting text to be later than the unrestricted text or accompanying it, so as to be a restriction for it, or so as to apply the unrestricted text upon the restricted one. Therefore the general remains upon its generality due to the absence of any specifying text to specify

it; and the absolute remains upon its unrestricted nature due to the absence of any restricting text that the unrestricted can be restricted with it or applied on it.

As for the *Sunnah*, this is due to what the two Sheikhs reported from the *hadith* of 'Abdullah bin 'Umar who said: The Messenger of Allah ﷺ said:

أُمِرْتُ أَنْ أَقْاتِلَ النَّاسَ حَتَّىٰ يَشْهُدُوا أَنَّ لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا اللَّهُ وَأَنَّ مُحَمَّداً رَسُولُ اللَّهِ
وَيَقِيمُوا الصَّلَاةَ وَيَؤْتُوا الزَّكَاةَ فَإِنْ فَعَلُوا ذَلِكَ عَصَمُوا مِنْ دَمَاءِهِمْ إِلَّا
بِحَقِّهَا وَحْسَابُهُمْ عَلَى اللَّهِ تَعَالَى

"I was commanded to fight the people until they bear witness that 'La ilaha illa Allah, Muhammad Rasul-Allah', establish the prayer and pay the zakat. If they do that, they safeguard their blood from me except with its due right, and their accounting is with Allah." And in another narration:

أُمِرْتُ أَنْ أَقْاتِلَ النَّاسَ حَتَّىٰ يَقُولُوا لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا اللَّهُ فَإِذَا قَالُوهَا فَقَدْ عَصَمُوا مِنْ
دَمَاءِهِمْ وَأَمْوَالِهِمْ إِلَىٰ بِحَقِّهَا وَحْسَابُهُمْ عَلَى اللَّهِ

"I was commanded to fight the people until they say 'La ilaha illa Allah.' If they say that, they safeguard their blood and property from me except with its due right, and their accounting is with Allah." And what Muslim reported from Sulayman bin Buraydah from his father: "When the Messenger ﷺ would command an Amir over an army or expedition, he advised him to fear Allah in himself and goodness for the Muslims with him. Then he would say:

أَغْرِوْ بِاسْمِ اللَّهِ فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ ، قَاتِلُوا مِنْ كُفُرِ بِاللَّهِ
, اغْرِوْ وَلَا تَعْلُوْ ، وَلَا تَغْدِرُوا وَلَا تُنْتَلُوا ، وَلَا تَقْتُلُوا وَلِيْدَا ، وَإِذَا لَقِيْتُ
عُدُوكَ مِنَ الْمُشْرِكِينَ فَادْعُهُمْ إِلَىٰ ثَلَاثَ خَصَالٍ أَوْ خَلَالٍ فَإِنْتَهُمْ مَا أَجَابُوكَ
فَاقْبِلْ مِنْهُمْ وَكُفْ عَنْهُمْ ، ثُمَّ ادْعُهُمْ إِلَىِ الإِسْلَامِ فَإِنْ أَجَابُوكَ فَاقْبِلْ مِنْهُمْ
وَكُفْ عَنْهُمْ ، ثُمَّ اجْعَهُمْ إِلَىِ التَّحْوِلِ مِنْ دَارِ الْمُهَاجِرِينَ وَخَبِيرُهُمْ أَنْهُمْ إِنْ

فَعَلُوا ذَلِكَ فَلَهُمْ مَا لَمْ يَحْجُرْهُنَّ وَعَلَيْهِمْ مَا عَلَىِ الْمُهَاجِرِينَ ، فَإِنْ أَبْوَا أَنْ
يَحْوِلُوا مِنْهَا فَأَخْبِرُهُمْ أَنَّهُمْ يَكُونُونَ كَأَعْرَابِ الْمُسْلِمِينَ يَجْرِي عَلَيْهِمْ حُكْمُ
اللَّهِ الَّذِي يَجْرِي عَلَىِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ وَلَا يَكُونُ لَهُمْ الْغَنِيمَةُ وَالْفَيْ شَيْ إِلَّا أَنْ
يَجْاهِدُوا مَعَ الْمُسْلِمِينَ ، فَإِنْ هُمْ أَجَابُوكَ مِنْهُمْ
وَكُفْ عَنْهُمْ ، فَإِنْ هُمْ أَبْوَا فَاسْتَعْنُ بِاللَّهِ عَلَيْهِمْ وَقَاتِلُهُمْ

'Attack in the name of Allah in the way of Allah. Attack and do not misappropriate (from the booty), betray, mutilate or kill children. When you meet your enemy, invite them to three matters (khisal) or (khilal), so whichever they respond to, accept from them and desist from (fighting) them. Invite them to Islam; if they respond to you, accept it from them and desist from them. Then call them to move from their homeland to the homeland of the Muhajireen. Inform them that if they do that, then for them (in rights) is what is for the Muhajireen, and against them (in duties) is what is against the Muhajireen. If they refuse to move, inform them that they are like the bedouin Muslims; the rule of Allah that apply upon the believers apply upon them but there is no spoils of war or booty for them except if they fight together with the Muslims. If they refuse, ask them for the jizyah; if they respond to you, accept from them and desist from them. If they refuse, seek assistance in Allah against them and fight them.'

These two *hadith* are explicit that *Jihad* is initiating the fighting. And the Messenger of Allah ﷺ initiated fighting Hawazin at Hunayn, Thaqif at Taif, and the Byzantine Romans in Mu'tah and Tabuk. And he went forth to fight twenty seven ghazwat (battles led by the Messenger) in nine years apart from the expeditions (led by companions).

As for *Ijma'a Us-Sahabah* that *Jihad* is fighting in the way of Allah to spread Islam, and that it is initiating the fighting, the conquests of Iraq, Persia, Ash-Sham, Egypt, North Africa, Khurasan, Kabul, Sijistan etc, suffice to prove it. The Copts of Egypt did not attack the Muslims, and the Berbers and Dailem did not attack them. All of these countries were conquered at the time of the *Sahabah*, and they initiated the fighting

against them and conquered these lands. After that, is there room for saying that *Jihad* is only defensive war and that there is no offensive war in Islam?

Conclusion

In brief, the clash of civilisations is an inevitable matter. It existed in the past, exists now and will remain until the clash ends shortly before the Hour, since it does not come except upon the worst of creation. Do not be deceived, O Muslims, by the callers to the dialogue who place their heads in the sand and condone humiliation and defeat. Make the preparations required for the conflict, since the Capitalist Western civilisation has knocked you down militarily, politically and economically; however they will never defeat you intellectually. Your '*aqeedah*' is hard to defeat; and it remains alive in the souls, except that some concepts of your civilisation coming out from your '*aqeedah*' have been afflicted with some contamination and some dust has struck them. So work to purify them and shake the dust away from it by returning to the Book and *Sunnah*. Beware of accepting a saying without evidence, or accepting a saying with evidence from a non-mujtahid or from the one reporting from him. This is the period of ignorant leaders, who give *fatawa* without knowledge. So beware of them, and search for sincere active scholars, and take your *deen* from them, for they are the lamps in the darkness, and they are few today. And know, that the ultimate triumph and victory is for Islam and Muslims. This is what Allah and His Messenger promised us in definite reports (*akhbar qat'iyya*), so be confident in the good promise of Allah. Work to appoint your *Khaleefah*, and establish your community (*jama'ah*) over one man from among you so as he makes the preparations, unifies the *Ummah*, terrifies the enemy, protects the territories, deals with the citizens justly, distributes equally, and Allah makes at his hands this *deen* dominant over all other *deens*, even if the polytheists detest it.

O Allah, guide the *Ummah* of Muhammad to that which pleases You and make it deserve Your support. O Most Merciful, we are weak at Your door, appealing for Your help and seeking Your protection, dedicated in utter submission to You, desperate for Your help. Support Your *deen*, verify Your promise, and bring down Your Victory. For You is the praise in every situation.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

